



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

872,544





THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

85111

VOL. XII. NEW SERIES.

64

JANUARY—APRIL,

MDCCCLXIX.

LONDON:

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17 PORTMAN STREET,

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.

DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.

1869.

AP  
4  
. D.82

V.12 n.s.

LONDON :  
WIMAN AND SONS, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,  
LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

# CONTENTS.

---

## ART. I.—SENIOR'S IRISH VOYAGES.

Remarkable reception of Mr. Senior's book . . . . .	1
Mr. Senior and Giraldus Cambrensis . . . . .	2
Real character of Mr. Senior's book . . . . .	3
Mr. Steuart Trench . . . . .	4
The rules of the Lansdowne estate . . . . .	8
The Donoghue murder . . . . .	10
The Barony of Farney . . . . .	15
The function of landlords . . . . .	16
Malthus and Calvin . . . . .	17
Lord Rosse's habit of personality . . . . .	18
Mr. Senior on O'Connell . . . . .	19
On the Catholic religion . . . . .	23
On the Irish Priests . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Conclusion . . . . .	26

---

## ART. II.—THEORIES ON DEVELOPMENT OF THE FAITH.

Effect of the Bull Ineffabilis as to theories on development . . . . .	28
1. Anglican theory that development is purely verbal . . . . .	31
Mr. Liddon's view that certain Catholics of the first centuries only differed verbally from the Nicene definition . . . . .	32
This view disproved by facts . . . . .	33
Dean Mansel's view that there is no development because theological terms are unintelligible . . . . .	37
First condition of development. The doctrine developed must from the first have been understood by the Church's teachers . . . . .	38
2. Hegel's theory, that development implies real contradiction, and that all heresy is a phase of the Truth . . . . .	40
Prevalence of this theory at Oxford . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Comparison of Hegel with Eunomius . . . . .	42
Catholic answer to the two . . . . .	44
Pantheistic basis of Hegel's theory . . . . .	45

The Saint enters the laura of S. Sabas . . . . .	349
His "de Fide Orthodoxâ" . . . . .	351
His other Treatises . . . . .	357
His Hymns . . . . .	359

---

#### ART. IV.—CATHOLIC CONTROVERSIES.

Relation of Catholic Controversies to the Church's unity of faith . . .	361
The Church has herself condemned tenets as unsound without condemn- ing them as heretical . . . . .	363
She has encouraged her children to write in the vernacular against condemned non-heretical errors .. . . .	365
She has praised those who protested against heresies as such, before she condemned them . . . . .	370
Unity of the Church's faith . . . . .	371
The Church's attitude towards condemned non-heretical errors . . .	372
Converts should not be kidnapped under false pretences . . . . .	375
Importance of their clearly understanding the great amount of intellectual submission which will be required of them . . . . .	376
The aggressive Catholic controversies, undue violations of the Church's peace . . . . .	378
Should they be reserved for the Theological Schools? . . . . .	380
Firm interior assent is due to certain judgments which are not strictly infallible . . . . .	382
Consideration of various current comments in the DUBLIN REVIEW . .	383

---

#### ART. V.—THE CONVENT CASE.

English juries have not yet learned justice to Catholics . . . . .	385
Miss Saurin's opening evidence on the original cause of the contention .	385
Her counsel at the end tacitly abandoned this charge . . . . .	387
The Judge called attention to this discrepancy . . . . .	387
His testimony to the excellent evidence given by the sisters . . . . .	389
The jurymen must have been convinced that nuns would have no scruple in committing perjury for defence of their order . . . . .	390
The jurymen were honest, but the mind of Englishmen is quite warped on such matters . . . . .	391
English comments on convent life are inconsistent with any one part of the dogma of the Incarnation . . . . .	394
The ascetic principle is the one conservative element of modern Europe .	395

---

#### ART. VI.—F. PEREZ' AND MR. LONGFELLOW'S DANTE.

F. Perez' view of the Purgatorio . . . . .	399
The theological theory of Purgatory . . . . .	400



Dante's conception of the new aerial body . . . . .	403
Patience of the suffering souls . . . . .	404
Their compunction and devotion . . . . .	407
Their prayer . . . . .	407
The seven capital sins . . . . .	410
General character of F. Perez' work . . . . .	424
Mr. Longfellow's notes and translation . . . . .	424

---

ART. VII.—RITUALISTIC DIVINITY AND LAW.

Melancholy position of the Ritualists . . . . .	425
Abbé Edgeworth's conversion . . . . .	426
The great Ritualist delusion . . . . .	428
The branch theory . . . . .	429
Communion in the early Church . . . . .	432
The Ritualist view of Absolution . . . . .	434
The Catholic doctrine of Absolution . . . . .	437
The late judgment of the Privy Council . . . . .	440
The effect on Ritualistic worship . . . . .	441
Their attitude in regard to it . . . . .	443
Its effect on the Puritan party . . . . .	444
In one respect the judgment a triumph to Ritualists . . . . .	445
Mr. Chambers' charges against Lord Cairns . . . . .	447
The Royal Supremacy . . . . .	449
The future of the Anglican Church . . . . .	450

---

ART VIII.—MR. GLADSTONE'S IRISH POLICY.

Lord Palmerston's Irish Policy . . . . .	452
Condition of Ireland under his government . . . . .	453
Mr. Gladstone's action in Irish affairs . . . . .	455
Mr. Disraeli's attitude in regard to the Church Establishment . . . . .	456
The conditions of Mr. Gladstone's policy . . . . .	458
His method of disestablishment . . . . .	459
His method of disendowment . . . . .	461
The case of the Maynooth Professors . . . . .	462
The settlement of the Church lands . . . . .	463
The next step . . . . .	464

---

IX.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Letters of Pius IX. on the Gallican Articles . . . . .	465
The Civiltà Cattolica . . . . .	467
Mgr. Dupanloup on the General Council . . . . .	474
M. Bouix' Tractatus de Papâ . . . . .	476

## IX.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Dr. Murphy's <i>Acta Concilii Baltimoriensis</i>	. . . . .	212
Cardinal Wiseman's <i>Daily Meditations</i>	. . . . .	212
Canon Walker's <i>Essay on First Principles</i>	. . . . .	216
Mr. Meynell's <i>Padre Liberatore</i>	. . . . .	216
Mr. Martineau's <i>Word for Scientific Theology</i>	. . . . .	217
Archbishop of York's <i>Limits of Philosophical Inquiry</i>	. . . . .	217
Mr. Maurice on the <i>Conscience</i>	. . . . .	217
Mr. Lloyd's <i>Freedom of the Will</i>	. . . . .	218
Abbé Laforet's <i>Why Men do not Believe</i>	. . . . .	221
F. Lockhart's <i>Communion of Saints and Secession of Schism</i>	. . . . .	222
M. Bouix's <i>Condamnation de Galilée</i>	. . . . .	223
<i>Révue Catholique</i>	. . . . .	225
Abbé Charbonnel's <i>Pensées de Veuillot</i>	. . . . .	226
<i>The Month</i>	. . . . .	227
Dr. Vaughan's <i>National Tendencies and Duties of Catholics</i>	. . . . .	228
Mr. Gladstone's <i>Chapter of Autobiography</i>	. . . . .	229
Mr. MacColl's <i>Is there not a Cause?</i>	. . . . .	232
Mr. Buckley's <i>Life of Father O'Leary</i>	. . . . .	233
<i>Life of Marie Eustelle-Harpain</i>	. . . . .	241
Mr. Yonge's <i>Life of Lord Liverpool</i>	. . . . .	242
Mr. Cobb's <i>Kiss of Peace</i>	. . . . .	243
Mr. Mills on <i>Dean Stanley's Characteristics of the Papacy</i>	. . . . .	251
Mr. King's <i>Keighley Hall and other Poems</i>	. . . . .	252
Mr. Ffoulkes's <i>Church's Creed or Crown's Creed</i>	. . . . .	252
Mr. McCarthy's <i>Lives of Benedictine Writers</i>	. . . . .	257
Sir John Manndevile's <i>Voyage and Travaille</i>	. . . . .	260
Mr. Hood's <i>Lamps, Trumpets, and Pitchers</i>	. . . . .	261
M. Guyot's <i>Somme des Conciles</i>	. . . . .	264
<i>The New Testament Narrative</i>	. . . . .	265
Abbot Gueranger's <i>Liturgical Year</i>	. . . . .	267

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1869.

---

ART. I.—SENIOR'S IRISH VOYAGES.

*Journals, Conversations, and Essays relating to Ireland.* By NASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR. Second Edition. London, Longmans, Green, and Co.

*Realities of Irish Life.* By W. STEUART TRENCH, Land Agent in Ireland. London : Longmans, Green, & Co.

THE startling discoveries of the late Mr. Nassau Senior, during his occasional expeditions to Ireland, are, we respectfully submit, obtaining an undue and even dangerous degree of acceptance in England at present. Within a few months, the book, which is not light reading, has gone to a second edition; and is already cited by the choir of newspapers as an authority with a sort of oracular sanction. The higher organs of opinion have been suspiciously emulous in exalting its value. They speak of it as a complete revelation of the great Celtic mystery. Before the book was a week old, the *Quarterly Review*, to our extreme astonishment, declared:—“This work as a whole will enable England to understand Ireland as she has never done before, and will show us how much hitherto we have been alike legislating, sympathizing, and declaiming in the dark.” As one half of the whole of Mr. Senior's Irish lucubrations consists of articles reprinted from the *Edinburgh Review*, the latest in date of which was published twenty years ago, we may, while admiring the generosity of the criticism, humbly wonder at the length of time which the rays of even so sublime an intelligence have taken to traverse the space that intervenes between the atmosphere of the one periodical and the other. The *Edinburgh Review* naturally considers Mr. Senior's message as part of its own properties and trophies. Words are hardly adequate to assay its value. “These volumes,” we are told, “are a lasting monument of Mr. Senior's sterling ability and wisdom . . . a mine of sound thought on Irish affairs; and a repository of attractive research and keen observation in the

same field." Is it presumption to suggest that these epithets are somewhat inept, if not extravagant? Ability and wisdom in public affairs generally find a more lasting monument even than books. The thoughts of a sound thinker on the policy of a great state, who has the opportunity to be heard (and Mr. Senior had great opportunities), gradually translate themselves into laws and institutions. Mr. Senior made many suggestions for the good government of Ireland, of which not one—not even the occasional Convocation of the Imperial Parliament in Dublin, not even the abolition of the Lord Lieutenantcy, not even the pensioning of the priests—was attempted in his own time, or can be reckoned as other than superannuated and impracticable now. English travellers, ever since the time of Giraldus Cambrensis, have been remarkable, according to the opinion of their own countrymen, for the "attractive research" and "keen observation" which they have devoted to the study of that island and its inhabitants. The English nation, to do it justice, has always been anxious to listen to any one who could give it an argument capable of being comprehended with complacency, for its occupation of a country which it is unable to understand, and which revolts unceasingly against its rule. Giraldus wrote before the age of reviews, but we have evidence little less valuable of his success with his contemporaries, who wished to understand offhand all about Ireland once for all. Giraldus said it was a country in which there was a talking wolf, a bearded woman, and a bull with a human head; that in remote parts of it, baptism was very irregularly administered; that its people had musical tastes and homicidal propensities, its very saints in heaven were vindictive, and its priests addicted in the evening hours to the worship of Bacchus, *vino variisque potionibus*—all obviously good and sufficient grounds for the conquest of the country. Ireland was conquered accordingly, and has been repeatedly more or less completely conquered since. The views of the more enlightened English of the present day take the direction of depopulation. Mr. Senior's views differ in so far from those of Giraldus Cambrensis. He objects that the priests of the present day do not preach the Gospel according to Malthus; that the landlords as yet only imperfectly apprehend that their true mission on earth is to check the increase and multiplication of mankind, and to further the spread of civilization by cattle; and that the British Government and the British nation are bound to sustain the landlords in their efforts to "prevent the whole country from becoming a warren of yahoos." "Keen observation" and "attractive research" thus equally characterize

the British traveller in the nineteenth century as in the twelfth.

It was not reasonable to expect that Mr. Senior's book should be a profound book. The character of his mind and his sources of information equally forbade that; and tended to make it a book in many respects worse than worthless—in some respects, we do not hesitate to say, even wicked. He was a man with the heart of a mere economist, the “obdurate heart,” in which “there is no flesh,” and no feeling for man as man; and he was unable both from the narrow and pragmatical quality of his intellect, and the specialty of his studies, to form any broad and liberal conception of the condition of the Irish people, to enter into any sort of sympathy with them, therefore to understand or enable anybody else to understand them. So far do we differ from current criticism that we venture to say the English student of Mr. Senior will know rather less of that aspect of Ireland which really needs to be known by England, when he has come to the end of these volumes than he probably did at their commencement. The fair-minded Englishman's ordinary impression that Ireland is a country half conquered, half colonised, never conciliated, in which the law of the land has for a long time been opposed to the genius of the people, and in which a class tyranny has been implanted, such as is unknown in any other free country, will probably have been considerably confused. Mr. Senior believed that so base and abnormal were the instincts and habits of the race inhabiting the island, that only the energetic action of the English law, by the hands of the Irish landlords, could prevent it from sinking into a swarming barbarism, held together by a bond of murder. Prepossessed against the country by character and training, Mr. Senior was, besides, peculiarly unfortunate in the class of persons with whom he came in contact when he visited it. Any intelligent Irishman could tell beforehand what views of the state of Ireland a stranger was likely to form, who went from Archbishop Whately's house to Lord Rosse's, thence to Lord Monteagle's; and who always received his latest lights from Mr. Steuart Trench. It is like the case of an officer who is taken blindfold through a camp, having the bandage taken off only at the points where it is desired to produce a false impression. Mr. Senior naturally cites each and every one of these authorities as infallible, equally infallible, the wise men, and the only wise men of Gotham. He drew them out, they knew he was drawing them out, he wrote down what they said, and they revised it. Not every one knows his Boswell beforehand. Not every one has the privilege of assisting his



Boswell in the concoction of his memoirs. But Mr. Senior first noted the conversations at Redesdale, or Birr Castle, or Cardtown, and then asked the various interlocutors to revise their parts. Bishop Blougram neither knew nor cared what use Gigadibs was going to make of his confidences; but here Gigadibs gives his friends notice beforehand that he is about to embalm all their favourite hobbies, and that the higher they trot, the better he will be pleased. That paradox and affectation should characterize the conversation of a coterie of persons periodically assembled under such auspices, is not surprising. That a peer, with a mechanical turn of mind, should flounder when invited to dogmatize on affairs of administration—that even the dry archbishop should pose himself a little absurdly, conscious of being thus brought on the sly face to face with posterity, is no more than it was natural to expect. That a series of conversations, held together by this covenant of egotism, among a group of persons, who were all, for one reason or other, malignants and *frondeurs* against the public spirit of the country in which their lot was cast, should also produce upon the mind the effect of a conspiracy of scandal against the character of that country, is not so strange; but we confess to some surprise at their occasional scurrility. Lord Rosse, Dr. Whately, with Mr. Senior himself, have passed away, and are beyond reach of the melodious acclaim with which their mutual admiration is still saluted by the “chorus of indolent reviewers.” But Mr. Steuart Trench is alive, and he has been encouraged by the far-spreading shade of Mr. Senior’s fame and the indefatigable indolence of the British reviewer, to attempt his own apotheosis. Mr. Steuart Trench is the land agent of the Marquis of Bath, the Marquis of Lansdowne, and the Lord Digby. He was Mr. Senior’s favourite authority in regard to the tendencies of the Irish race towards Yahoodom. Mr. Senior had designed to present him to posterity in the part of the Hero as land agent; but Mr. Trench has been able to survive Mr. Senior, and so to anticipate posterity; and suddenly finding himself famous, he will not shrink from “the peril of his own panegyric.” Accordingly, in a volume with the romantic title “Realities of Irish Life,” he has written a considerable proportion of his own autobiography. He describes himself as a person of heroic courage, overflowing humanity, benign wisdom, indomitable will, indefatigable energy, polite manners, and engaging affability. This enumeration does not, doubtless, comprehend the sum of his virtues. The rest may be learned on application to the tenantry of the Lansdowne, the Bath, or the Digby estates. The book has been illustrated by Mr. Trench’s son. Appear-

ing at the Christmas season, when goblins and giants task the efforts of our best artists, it at first occurred to us that it might be intended to pourtray the adventures of some Irish Munchausen. Opening its pages, as it happened, about the middle chapter, an extraordinary scene met our view. Under lofty cliffs, three male persons navigate a boat. The inscription says, "The guide wore a waistcoat"; and, as a matter of fact, among these adventurous gentlemen there is no superfluity of raiment apparent. They all wear their hats, however, on which are planted flaming torches; and the effect, sufficiently absurd, is made inconceivably ludicrous by the evident seriousness of the artist. Four more illustrations, one full-length, are devoted to the adventures of the three gentlemen; and we are informed, by the accompanying text, that this is the way in which seal-hunting is sometimes conducted in the county of Kerry. As to Mr. Trench himself, it would appear, that on all the great and heroic occasions of his life, he was either dressed as a Bond Street exquisite of the days of D'Orsay, or hardly dressed at all. The frontispiece represents him stripped to the waist, like some accomplished prize-fighter, who waits the ring to be formed, and his rival for the belt to advance. A little further on, Mr. Trench, still stripped to the waist, but evidently attired by Poole as to the rest of his person, addresses with beaming countenance and graceful gestures an apparently enthusiastic crowd of Irish peasants. On the cover of the book we see him, as he suddenly confronted in his own house one of Lord Bath's tenants, who was in arrears of rent, with a revolver in either hand, but obviously in a state of wild panic. The unfortunate tenant behaved remarkably well at the moment; but he died of the shock a fortnight afterwards. Then we have an illustration of a truly historical occasion, upon which Mr. Trench and another land-agent, named Morant, who dressed himself in a buffalo-hide for the occasion, and who, we are told, "looked down on the admiring peasantry with the most supreme indifference and contempt for his enemies expressed in every feature of his face" (Mr. Morant's enemies, it would appear, were his neighbours, and he did not love them as he loved himself) left the town of Carrickmacross one morning, bristling with pistols, amid, as Mr. Trench naïvely confesses, "the incessant nudges and winks" of the bystanders, under the impression that they might possibly be shot before their return. They were not shot, nor even shot at; but there is another illustration of their return late at night, with the Ribbonmen, who are supposed to have intended to have shot at them, but who did

not, picturesquely posted behind a hedge. The finest effort of Mr. Townsend Trench's artistic genius, however, is his sketch of the meeting of the Ribbon Lodge, at which his father was sentenced to death. As the book professes to deal only with the "Realities of Irish Life," we are sorry to be obliged to surmise that Mr. Townsend Trench was present on such an occasion. The British reader can, however, in consequence, study an authentic representation of the Yahoo in council, taken with all the details from the life; and he can elsewhere see a drawing of the insignia of a Grand Master of Ribbonmen, which seem to have suggested those of the Star of India. It is a very remarkable fact that, throughout his career, Mr. Trench appears to have been always on the point of being shot, but that he never costs the Ribbon armoury so much as a detonating cap. Is it possible that some of his "Realities" may only be unconscious romances, with some basis of original fact, exaggerated at the time by panic, afterwards by imagination, and gradually distended by dramatic recitation to admiring audiences in the myth-developing after-dinner hours at Cardtown or Carrickmacross? In our humble opinion, imagination is, with Mr. Trench, much more powerful than memory. It so happens that we are not unacquainted with some of those sad episodes of Irish history in which he has played so remarkable a part; and we observe that what seems to us to be the key of the enigma is almost always wanting in his narrative. The book appears to have been written as an exegetic commentary on Mr. Senior's doctrine about Ireland and the Irish; and in it we therefore find facts selected and collocated so as to sustain a theory, and thus give the effect of fiction; some of the most important links of evidence dropped; the principle upon which the peasantry acted, often criminally, no doubt, utterly ignored or misrepresented; and a hue of rosy benevolence flowing over acts of the most questionable morality and justice. For example, Mr. Trench was chiefly instrumental in exporting some 4,600 people from Lord Lansdowne's estate in Kerry to the United States, at a cost of £3. 10s. a head. It was a very good bargain for the estate, on which they were of course chargeable for life as paupers; and the cost even of an Irish pauper, Mr. Senior says, is £4. 11s. *per annum*. "It must be admitted," he says, "that the paupers despatched to America on such a sudden pressure as this were of a very motley type; and a strange figure these wild batches of two hundred each—*most of them speaking only the Irish language*—made in the streets of Cork, as well as on the quays of Liverpool and America,"—where they landed without a shilling in their pockets. So far the

enterprise was managed doubtless with keen economy and with reckless disregard of consequences. The people were glad to go anywhere rather than to the workhouse. The landlord got rid of them altogether for less than one year's rates. "Happily," Mr. Trench adds, "no accident ever occurred in a single ship which carried out the Kenmare emigrants. Almost all, down even to the widows and children, found employment soon after landing, and escaped the pestilence of the workhouse; and to this hour I can never experience any other feelings but those of pleasure and gratification at having been the means of sending so many miserable beings to a land far richer and more prosperous than Ireland." The peculiar pestilence of the Kenmare Workhouse is doubtless bad enough, both for landlord and tenant; and Mr. Trench is entitled to whatever pleasure and gratification he may feel at having been the means of sending many miserable beings to a land far richer and more prosperous than Ireland—or even than America. He can hardly fail to be aware, but he has forgotten to mention the fact, that in one of the principal hospitals of the city of New York there is a ward which is called the Lansdowne Ward; and the reason why it bears this name is that for months and months together, it was crowded by the emigrants from the Lansdowne estate, who left it commonly in their coffins. America must be a generous country to tolerate such a thing as this—that one Irish absentee landlord, wanting to reduce his rates, should summarily disembogue 4,600 half-starved, penniless, and diseased outcasts on one of its ports. Had this been tried at Liverpool or Bristol, what would people have said of Lord Lansdowne! That Mr. Trench should now relate it to the British public as an example of magnanimous philanthropy shows at once the cast of his character, and his estimate of the state of opinion, generated considerably by indolent reviewing, on such subjects.

Mr. Thomas Trench, the second son of Mr. Stuart Trench, and sub-agent of Lord Digby's property, a gentleman who followed his daily pursuits with revolvers in his pockets and an escort of police lounging at his window-sill or balancing his outside-car, was one day walking with Mr. Senior on the side of the hill of Baureigh, in the Queen's County. Mr. Senior was very anxious to know all about landlords and tenants, and here was a fine opportunity. Trench the younger had had manifold experience; had seen many estates and the bailiffs thereof; knew all about the raising of the highest amount of rent, as scientific people understand hydraulic pressure; also about extermination on the grand scale and the small, whether

by clearance or by consolidation; believed himself withal a leading agent of civilization in Ireland, civilization and man in that country being, if not incompatible, at least inconsistent, and it being the manifest duty of two out of every three Irishmen to go to America in order to make room for bullocks—a doctrine so little appreciated in Mr. Thomas Trench's neighbourhood, that he came to suspect every bush of hiding a blunderbuss, but nevertheless had his father's luck, and was never shot or even shot at.

The way in which Mr. Trench came to be agent of the Digby estates is itself a striking illustration of the law of landlord and tenant in Ireland. The old Lord Digby had given his tenants liberal leases. The new Lord Digby was advised that he had exceeded his legal powers in so doing, and resolved to annul the leases. At this moment Mr. Trench was appointed agent. He succeeded in settling terms with the executors of the old lord for compensation of the various leasehold interests, on the very eve of the trial of the whole question at the Tullamore Assizes; and the tenantry—who do not love the law, it is true, feeling that the law has never yet learned to love them—took the terms, agreed that their leases should be treated as cancelled, and entered upon the earthly beatitude of tenancy at will under the auspices of Mr. Steuart Trench. As usual in Ireland, all the improvements which separated the condition of the country from a state of nature had been made by the tenantry. They became the property of Lord Digby. The rents were raised all over the estate by a valuation—that is to say, in proportion as a tenant had improved his farm on the faith of his lease, in so far did he find that he had succeeded in racking his rent.

Mr. Thomas Trench appears to have thought not utterly in vain of these things, and he even complained to Mr. Senior in a general sort of way that there was no protection by law for the property of the tenants:—

There is no tribunal, he said, which is entitled to say, “the value of the improvements made by the tenant is A.; he has had the use of them, without additional rent, for B. years; the compensation to which he is entitled if the farm is taken from him is C.”

This seems reasonable, especially on the lips of a land-agent. But it was too much for the professor of civilization by cattle: Mr. Senior replied:—

I suppose, I said, that the verdict of such a tribunal would frequently be, “What the tenant calls improvements are mischiefs. This cabin ought never to have been built. No attempt ought to have been made to till this



land ; it ought to be returned to the sheep and black cattle from whom it was taken."

This view, fully drawn out, would lead to the conclusion that sheep and black cattle had a prior existence and prior rights to man in Ireland. Mr. Senior would, we doubt not, be lavish of praise to the industry which had reclaimed a Swiss crag or a Dutch fen. But it comes natural to an English economist of his school to conclude that the industry of the Celt is, if possible, a worse quality than his indolence.

"Without doubt," Mr. Trench answered ; "and such is the necessary result of the Irish system of allowing the tenant to deal with the land without the interference of the owner. But if the owner do interfere, he does so at the peril of his life. *One of my father's great difficulties at Kenmare is his determination that if a younger son or daughter marry, the new couple shall quit the parent cabin.*"

Now this passage is, we submit, a passage to meditate upon. One can make points out of it, pictures out of it ; it suggests what the ascetic writers call "a spiritual bouquet" of strange flavour. Consider, in the first place, that there is nothing in the context to mitigate its unconscious, unsophisticated atrocity. Mr. Senior wrote it down, Mr. Trench long afterwards revised it. Neither thought it necessary to add a note of extenuation or explanation. Such a frame of mind on the part of a white man in the nineteenth century, probably baptized, certainly what is called educated, may, we believe, afford a curious psychological study to future generations. The dialogue will be suggestive to some playwright, who finds that audiences weary of scenes drawn from the life of the French peasantry before the great Revolution, or the Virginian negro before the great Civil War. If every other record of Irish landlord power shall have been obliterated, some historian of genius may reconceive the whole structure from that single sentence, as a great naturalist is said to have designed the whole frame of a mastodon from a single joint of its toe. Was there, we ask in all simplicity, anything worse than this thing in the theory of the seigniorial rights or in the planter's power ? Crimes of a more grievous die were, we doubt not, committed in either case ; but the crimes were against, and not according to, French or American law. Now we cannot call Mr. Trench's conduct in this matter a crime, because it appears to be according to English law ; and being according to law, he is, wherever his power extends, giving it the effect of custom. But the right that he claims, to put it in the plainest terms, is the right to compel a father to turn his child out of doors, because the child has presumed to marry

with the father's consent, but without Mr. Trench's. That is the point to which landlord power has been carried in Ireland; and the English opinion, which accepts Mr. Senior as an authority and applauds Mr. Trench as a hero, appears to regard it as a good thing. But will not the verdict of history be that it was a very bad thing; and will not men who walk these islands a century hence wonder that the fate which befell the French seigneurs and the Southern planters was, in the case of the Irish landlords, so long averted? Conceive the utter helplessness of insecurity to which the Irish tenant must have been reduced before such a barbarous power as this should dare to trample, should dare to make him trample, on the holiest ties of life; and at the very moment when his humble home knows the rare joy which the pure and happy marriage of the Irish peasant generally brings, compel him to banish his child from his hearth. When those who have been thus driven forth from home next become expatriated, and tell their tale to the men who dwell in free lands, is it any wonder that the law which tolerates such things acquires an ill name from end to end of the earth? What Head Centre has enrolled so many Fenians as Mr. Trench? It is a rule, then, it would appear, of the Lansdowne estate—if not an express rule, at least implied most clearly in the practice stated by Mr. Thomas Trench—that the license of the agent is a necessary preliminary to marriage in the family of a tenant. This is one of the "Realities of Irish Life" of which Mr. Steuart Trench's *Memoirs* omit all record; yet of that impious custom he is undoubtedly the author. Another rule of the Lansdowne estate is that which renders a tenant liable to eviction for giving shelter to any one, however nearly related, who may have been evicted from a holding on the estate, or to his children, or to any member of his family. The sentence of the agent of the Lansdowne estate has the power to stamp its subject as a Pariah, whom it is dangerous to know and ruinous to harbour. In consequence of this unnatural rule, a boy was once done to death on the Lansdowne estate; and his uncle and aunt were convicted of manslaughter not murder, because they had killed the boy, not out of malice, but because of the rule of the estate. It would be impossible to state the facts of the case with such force and feeling, not to say accuracy and authority, as they were detailed by Chief Baron Pigott, in passing sentence on these unfortunate persons. They are the words of a Judge whose scrupulous conscientiousness is such as to intensify the force of every word he uttered on such an occasion; and Mr. Steuart Trench is the agent referred to:—

The poor boy whose death you caused was between twelve and thirteen years of age. His mother at one time held a little dwelling from which she was expelled. His father was dead. His mother had left him, and he was alone and unprotected. He found refuge with his grandmother, who held a farm, from which she was removed in consequence of her harbouring this poor boy, as the agent on the property had given public notice to the tenantry that expulsion from their farms would be the penalty inflicted on them if they harboured any persons having no residence on the estate. This poor boy was then left without a house to shelter him or a friend to assist him. He was an unhappy outcast. . . . He went to the house of a man named Coffey, whose wife humanely gave him a little food, but she was afraid to shelter him in her house, as the agent had given orders that distress for twelvemonths' rent would be made on any tenant who should harbour persons not resident on the estate, and that they would also be expelled from their farms. He is turned adrift to the world, friendless and unprotected. He came to Casey's house, where you, his uncle and aunt, resided. He applied for relief, as he was in a state of destitution. Casey, with whom you lodged, desired you to turn him from the house, as he was afraid the orders of the agent would be enforced against him. . . . You committed the offence, not with a desire to inflict death, but influenced by fear that Casey would be expelled from his holding. The poor child is turned out of doors; and the next proof was, that you, Judith, took a pike-handle and beat him violently with it while lying on the ground. . . . He implored of you to spare him, and he promised to leave the place. He raised himself from the ground, and bound, as he was, went tottering along from house to house, but there was no refuge for the wretched outcast. As a last resource he turned his steps to Coffey's house, but some of the neighbours threatened to tell the agent if Coffey harboured him. Coffey had, however, the humanity to take him to Casey's house, where you resided. He fell twice from weakness and the result of the injuries you inflicted on him. He is supported to the house; and a scene ensued which I find difficult to describe. The door was opened by you, Judith, and a struggle ensues. Coffey and another man endeavoured to force the boy in—you keeping him out. He bleeds profusely. The threshold is smeared with blood. You succeed in keeping him out; and he, unable to walk, rolls himself along the ground, till he gets to the wall, where he remains. Night passes over him, and on the following morning he is found by the neighbours, cold, stiff, and dead. . . . I do not think, however, that you inflicted the injuries with an intention to cause death; it was through fear that the threat would be carried out against Casey. Casey acted under the influence of the threats of those in authority, but such is no justification for the offence. It forms no defence, that such an order was given as that which appeared in evidence on the trial. For an order from the execution of which death ensues is not only not sanctioned by law, but is directly at variance with it.

Mr. Steuart Trench appears to have thought the Chief Baron a very presumptuous person. The rules of the estate survived the sentence of the Donoghues. Their trial took place eleven years before the conversation at Baureigh in which Thomas Trench complained to Mr. Senior that one of his father's great difficulties at Kenmare was his determination that if a younger son or daughter marry, the new couple shall quit the parent cabin. "He knows," said Mr. T. Trench, "that if they remain, the consequences will be the subdivision of the farm, the almost invariable quarrelling of the family, and the misery of its occupants. This they will not at the time admit, and they accuse him—and above all the priests accuse him—of forbidding marriage and of encouraging profligacy." And obviously profligacy is encouraged by such a system as Mr. Trench pursues. If it is not a common result of it, that is due to the innate morality of the Irish peasantry. We know, even from the trial of the Donoghues, that it is a system destructive of the tenderest ties of flesh and blood, fatal to Christian charity, and that it has directly caused one most barbarous and unnatural murder. In all the "Realities of Irish Life" which Mr. Trench has witnessed, there is no ghastlier tragedy than the death of that poor boy whom he outlawed, and who died a cruel death, because he was an outlaw, on Lord Lansdowne's estate. It is a fine example of Mr. Trench's extraordinary effrontery of character that he never even alludes to this case, or to the existence of the rules of which it was one of the results. The argument for the rules is that they are necessary in order to prevent the subdivision of farms. A landlord is within his right when he forbids the subdivision of his farms: but he has no right to do so by a series of rules which are repugnant to the spirit of English law and of the Christian religion, and to the very instincts of human nature. It is possible to introduce such stringent covenants into agricultural leases as will make it the tenant's absolute interest not to sublet. But the rules of the Lansdowne estate are a code for tenants at will. They represent the lowest and basest form of tenure now existing on the face of the civilized globe; and it is evident that the tenants who live under such conditions can call neither their souls nor their bodies their own. The Russian serf, the Virginia slave were not obliged by rule to turn their children out of doors on the day of their marriage, or to refuse food and shelter to their kith and kin. The application of such rules to great properties and large masses of tenantry has another effect, that it encourages the smaller landlords and agents to acts of almost inconceivable arbitrariness. When the Marquis of

Lansdowne, the rising hope of the great Liberal party, who has just done Mr. Gladstone the honour of taking a seat on the Treasury Bench without salary, governs his Irish tenantry in such a fashion, what is to be expected from Mr. William Scully? When Lord Lansdowne makes it a cause of eviction for a tenant to shelter, even for a night, any one, however near by blood, or infirm, or forlorn, and ruthlessly exterminates even the grandmother who harbours for a while her orphan grandson, against whom the excommunication of the estate has gone forth, need we wonder that there are properties in the south of Ireland on which the very keeping of a dog, even where there are sheep to be watched, is a cause for eviction? And this brings us to the main argument of Mr. Senior's book which is that there are two laws in Ireland. "Ireland is still governed," he says, "by two codes, dissimilar and often opposed—one deriving its validity from Acts of Parliament, and maintained by the magistrate, the other laid down by the tenants and enforced by assassination." This is, like so many other sweeping generalisations about Ireland, which English writers have made from imperfect data hastily scraped together and impatiently digested, only a blunder with a smart air about it. There are extensive districts of Ireland, and in all its provinces, where a landlord or agent has not been murdered within the memory of man, or indeed within record; nor has landlord power been less abused in those districts than in others where there has been an almost continuous calendar of crime. If Mr. Trench were to endeavour to enforce the same rules in Monaghan that he has succeeded in establishing in Kerry, his life would not be worth a month's purchase. The tendency to agrarian conspiracy and assassination is in Ireland most frequently associated with districts where there is a considerable admixture of race, combined with a peculiar tradition or custom of tenure—in Tipperary, for example, where a very large proportion of the tenantry are descended from the soldiers of Cromwell, who originally got their lands on the same terms that settlers now get land in Iowa or at Brisbane, and whose descendants or representatives conceive, not without historical, if without legal reason, that the landlord power has been—they cannot exactly explain how—produced by a gradual, stealthy usurpation of their original rights, and a violation of the spirit and terms of the settlement. The same spirit has at times extended through the adjoining counties, which were similarly colonized, and notably through Waterford, Limerick, King's County, and Westmeath. These counties were, of the Ten which were given directly to Cromwell's soldiers and the "Adventurers," the most closely settled; and in addition they



have received from time to time strong Huguenot and Palatine Colonies. But the contiguous counties of Connaught, the county of Kerry, and the greater part of the county of Cork, which were not settled—or not settled in the same way—the most purely Celtic and Catholic parts of Ireland—have always been remarkably free from agrarian crime. Again, along the whole extent of the southern frontier of the province of Ulster, through the counties of Louth, Monaghan, Cavan, Leitrim, and Sligo, where the population is of very mixed origin, and where the landlords have been lately endeavouring to restrict the limits and lower the authority of the custom of Ulster in regard to tenure, and on many estates have even succeeded in abolishing it—throughout this extensive district agrarian conspiracy has long been endemic, now violently active, never less than smouldering. But the interior of the province, where the tenant-right custom is supreme, is as free from agrarian crime as Yorkshire or Sussex. So have been, almost invariably, what were called the “reserved counties” of Leinster at the time of the Cromwellian Settlement, Dublin, Kildare, and Carlow, with the adjoining counties, Wicklow, the most purely Celtic county of the province, and Wexford, the scene of the earliest English settlements in Ireland, but where, by process of time, a considerable amalgamation of race has been produced, and where the early English colonists were and remained Catholic. In these districts, but in particular, we may say, throughout the more purely Celtic regions of the country, there has not been within the memory of man that ready resort for redress by murder in agrarian disputes which Mr. Senior describes in his stupid, wholesale way, as the salient characteristic of all Ireland. Nor has the conflict, properly speaking, ever been between the English law “deriving its validity from Acts of Parliament and maintained by the magistrate, and the other law laid down by the tenants and enforced by assassination.” For there has been a third law, stronger than either, a law unbearable by flesh and blood, opposed to Christian morals and Christian charity, incompatible with the dignity of man, and with civil liberty, sometimes codified, as in the rules of the Lansdowne estate, or in the Scully lease, but generally existing as an unwritten common law, and as a simple negation of all rights whatsoever to the occupying tenantry of the country.

Mr. Senior, who believes that the exterminating landlord is an instrument of God's good providence, and that the tenant is an assassin by blood and training, nevertheless understands perfectly well their respective contributions to the present

condition of the country. This is his succinct statement of the case :—

The Irish landlords, partly politically, and partly to obtain additional rent, by means of the potato, encouraged or (what was enough without active encouragement) permitted sub-division and the increase of population. The inhabitants of Ireland, from 4,088,226 in 1792, rose to 8,175,124 in 1841. The landlords were unable or unwilling to expend money on their estates. They allowed the tenants themselves to make the provision, by building and by reclaiming land from its original state of bog, or heather, or stony field, necessary to lodge and feed this increased population. It is thus that many estates have been created, and almost all have been enlarged, by generation after generation of tenants without assistance. It was the tenants who made the Barony of Farney, originally worth £3,000 a year, worth £50,000 a year."

The original value of the Barony of Farney, we learn from Mr. Trench, was £250 a year; and its valuation in 1843 was £46,395. Its rent-roll is now hardly less than £60,000 a year. One moiety of the barony is owned by the Marquis of Bath, the other by Mr. Evelyn Shirley. The Marquis of Bath has once deigned to visit this superb property for the space of three days; and there is a legend that his grandfather or great-grandfather exhibited a similar condescension. These occasions excepted, the owners of this segment of the estate have been absolute absentees for nearly three hundred years, during which the tenants have turned what was a wild alder wood, bordered by bogs and seamed by rocky valleys, into a fertile and splendid estate. The landlord of the adjoining section, Mr. Shirley, is not an absentee landlord. He is only one of those landlords whom their tenants would wish to be absentee. In the year 1849, he effected an extermination of his tenantry so ruthless in its character that it excited even public opinion in England. Mr. Trench in his book gives a very full history of the Barony of Farney, but he entirely omits this terrible passage in its annals—the real origin of the alarm and agitation, conspiracy and crime which followed, and which pervaded both estates. For the tenantry of Farney then conceived that the failure of the potato was to be taken advantage of to confiscate their interest in the enormous property which their and their forefathers' industry had admittedly created for the benefit of landlords, who hardly once in a hundred years came to see the place of which in the interval they knew naught except its ever-swelling rent-roll. Mr. Shirley, a landlord after Mr. Senior's heart, designed to clear his property as far as possible of men, and to put in cattle instead. Many of the evicted were not at all in arrears of

rent. Many of them occupied holdings which the unaided industry of successive generations had made worth hundreds and thousands of pounds. But Mr. Shirley did not see that they had any right to live there in consequence. Right of property on their part he would consider it unconscientious to admit. He did his work with great system. He had a machine constructed by which an ordinary farm-house could be levelled to the earth in twenty minutes.\* Some bed-ridden people, carried out while this operation was being effected, died on the road-side. The neighbouring workhouse was crowded to the point of epidemic.

But why dwell upon such incidents? Mr. Shirley was in his right; nay, he was doing his duty.

"That duty," says Mr. Senior, "the duty for the performance of which I believe that Providence created landlords is, *the keeping down population*. If there were no one whose interest it was to limit the numbers of the occupants of land, it would be tenanted by all whom it could maintain, just as a warren is tenanted by all the rabbits that it can feed; competition would force them to use the food that was most abundant—every failure of crop would produce a famine; they would have no surplus produce, and therefore no division of labour; no manufactures, except the coarse clothing and furniture which each family must produce for itself; no separation of ranks, no literature—in short, no civilization. . . . *To prevent all this, Providence created landlords—a class of persons whose interest it is that the land should produce as large as possible an amount of surplus produce, and for that purpose should be occupied by only the number of persons necessary to enable it to produce the largest possible amount beyond their own subsistence.*"

Minimum of population, maximum of rent! Minimum of man, maximum of beast! If this was the design of Providence in the creation of the human race, is it not strange that landlords were provided on such an utterly inadequate scale? Strange it is that there have been and are so many nations with surplus produce, separation of ranks, even literature and civilization itself—and yet utterly without landlords, utterly unconscious that they are frustrating the designs of Providence in not having landlords, and stranger still, that these God-forgotten nations are not becoming nevertheless like unto rabbit warrens, even Yahoo warrens. In Ireland indeed, where landlords have had very much their own way; where (to take the present century only into account) in one generation

---

\* This machine was, we believe, invented by the agent Morant, of whose appearance we give Mr. Trench's description at p. 5; but we have not heard whether it has been patented.

they stimulated the growth of population because that paid, and in the next generation proceeded to exterminate because that paid better still—Parliament impartially assisting both processes, enfranchising or disfranchising, giving facilities for subdivision or for depopulation, abolishing the forty shilling freeholders, or passing the Quarter Acre clause as required—the tenantry have not nevertheless learned to associate the institution with fine clothing and handsome furniture, with letters and æsthetics, with culture, and sweetness, and light. Mr. Senior, believing in the providential function of landlords, was at one time forcibly struck by the idea that it was possible to connect the economy of Malthus with the theology of Calvin. He had a conversation at Birr Castle in 1862 with a person who is designated by the initials A. B. (Archbishop Whately we suspect), and the question was as to the number of the elect.

“Real Calvinism is logical,” said A. B.; “if you assume the omnipotence and omniscience of the Deity, and deny his benevolence. It supposes that for the purpose of displaying His powers He created man. That for the same purpose He decreed that out of the millions of the human race a certain number shall be saved, and the rest, being the great majority, shall be damned. That the sacrifice of our Saviour was made for the redemption of the elect, being a small minority, and that its benefits extended only to that small minority.”

“Are the elect,” I said, “a number or a proportion?”

“A fixed number,” he answered.

“Then,” I said, “every increase of population increases only the number of the damned.”

“Certainly,” he answered.

Accordingly the Irish landlord, who fulfills the duty for which Providence created landlords, that of keeping down population, if he does not help to complete the ranks of the elect, at least helps to limit the number of the damned. When we are brought face to face with this supernatural view of the position of the Irish landlord, we begin to see the force of the epithet “mine of wisdom,” as applied to Mr. Senior.

We have alluded to a certain tone of low personal scurrility rather prevalent in Mr. Senior's Irish clique, but which seems to have particularly characterized Lord Rosse's table, and for which that lamented nobleman appears indeed to have been himself mainly responsible. Here is one flagrant example. Mr. Senior was at Birr Castle immediately after the general election of 1852, and Lord Rosse, with every appearance of

perfect veracity, gave him (and years afterwards in deliberate cold blood revised), the following account of the result in the King's County :—

Captain Bernard, the Conservative candidate, had, according to his promises, an overwhelming majority. His opponent, a whisky seller—whose uncle, the head of the family, still lives in a cabin—beat him at the poll by two to one.

All the facts in this case happen to be easy of reference. The Liberal candidates at the King's County election of 1852 were Mr. (at present Sir Patrick) O'Brien and Mr. Loftus Bland, Q.C. As Mr. O'Brien was returned at the head of the poll, by 1,976 votes against 1,148, given for Captain Bernard, there can be no question that he is the person whom Lord Rosse demeaned himself by describing as "a whisky seller." The English reader, ignorant of the case and the place, taking the phrase with its context, and presuming Lord Rosse to be an exceptionally high-minded and accurate nobleman, would naturally presume that the Liberal candidate so spoken of was some low publican, projected into Parliament in defiance of decency by the villainy of priests and the violence of mobs. Now the whole statement was untrue, and Lord Rosse knew perfectly well that it was untrue. Mr. O'Brien was at the time of his election a barrister at law of eight years' standing, the eldest son of a baronet, who was also at the time a Member of Parliament of six years' standing, and who had received the Queen as Lord Mayor of Dublin, when Her Majesty visited Ireland in 1849. The only possible foundation for the expression was the fact that part of Sir Timothy O'Brien's large fortune was made by the sale of Irish whisky. Many great fortunes, and not a few titles, in England as well as Ireland, are due to the distillery or the brewery. In Dublin there has been created since a Conservative baronet, Sir Benjamin Guinness, whose fortune was made by the manufacture of Dublin stout. Can any one suppose that if the eldest son of Sir Benjamin Guinness had offered himself to contest the representation of the King's County on Conservative principles, Lord Rosse would have considered it fair to describe him as "the keeper of a beershop?" A hasty expression of this sort, used in the heat of a general election among people who knew all the circumstances and could take the phrase at its just worth, might be excused, but it is notable that Lord Rosse revised and even annotated Mr. Senior's journals, and that the terms are used so as to convey to a person who influenced English opinion, and to cause him to

put upon permanent record, a wholly false impression as to the way in which Irish Catholic politics are managed.

' "I have looked carefully over the returns," Lord Rosse continued, "and Ireland I find will give you in this Parliament only one Whig."

It is a pity Mr. Senior did not ask him who the one Whig was. It would be curious to ascertain by this exceptional example what was Lord Rosse's conception of a real Whig. The result of the general election of 1852 was that Ireland sent to Parliament at least forty only too steadfast supporters of the successive Ministries of Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston, of whom certainly not the least docile were the two honourable members for King's County.

The manner in which O'Connell was regarded by Mr. Senior's Irish coterie reminds one of the stories that are told of the style in which the more silly Legitimists used to speak, sixty years ago, of the "Corsican ogre." This portentous and unprecedented personage, whose eloquence moved such masses of men as had never been stirred to the same depth by the voice of a mere politician since the days of Demosthenes ; whose personal ascendancy over the nation amid whom he loved to dwell was a dominion that it would not be extravagant to compare to Napoleon's ; who possessed more legitimate power in the State than any single subject then possessed or had ever possessed ; and the fame of whose genius, whose great achievement, whose further designs filled the whole world—this great tribune, to produce the like of whom nature and history combine so rarely in the course of centuries, was, in the eyes of this circle of crabbed sciolists, only an obstreperous charlatan, and a sort of supreme incarnation of the spirit of Irish mendicancy.

O'Connell, said Lord Rosse, has left no successor, because from the time that emancipation was gained, his objects became purely personal ; and even as personal objects they were sordid, for they scarcely rose above the acquisition of money to be spent in keeping open house for his tools and flatterers.

Lord Rosse was about as capable of comprehending the character and policy of O'Connell, as O'Connell would have been capable of setting a speculum to Lord Rosse's great telescope. But Lord Rosse must have known about O'Connell's personal position, when emancipation was gained, certain facts that were notorious. One such fact was that he had at that time the largest practice at the Irish Bar ; that there was hardly any limit to its extent, or almost to its lucrativeness, except his inability to attend to it, caused by his devotion to



the public interest ; that he was, moreover, a man who, in his keen, athletic, manifold way, highly enjoyed the practice of his profession ; and that, after emancipation, there was no station of whatever rank or emolument, save one, among its many dignified offices which he might not have had simply by signifying the wish. Another such fact was that Mr. O'Connell, apart from his professional and political position, was a country gentleman of a very considerable inherited estate, for a Roman Catholic, in the county of Kerry ; and was as much at home with his pack of beagles on the hills over Darrynane, as when volubly pleading in his wig and gown at the Four Courts, or amid the ringing peals of cheers, thunderous in their volume, yet so touchingly tremulous with human tenderness and passion, that used always to break forth when he stood face to face with the people. He was by circumstances alone placed as much above such sordid objects as, so to speak, Lord Rosse himself. Mr. Senior hated O'Connell in just the same small silly way. In one of his *Edinburgh Review* articles, published in 1843, after premising that O'Connell "cannot be a sincere repealer," he proceeds to account for the formidable agitation against the Union, which was then convulsing the empire, in the following shallow and rancorous sentence :—"He appears to be influenced by all the religious and national antipathies of his least civilized countrymen ; and he has to avenge his own failure in the British Parliament, and what is more stinging—in British society." This idea was so pleasing to Mr. Senior's mind, which seems to have had a good deal of semi-feminine spite in it, that towards the close of the same article he resolved to elaborate the view ; but the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, it would seem, had the good sense to expunge the passage, which is now, however, restored, for the benefit of all who admire "the infinitely little," in a note. "In the House of Commons," he says, "O'Connell failed. His dishonesty, ignorance, and utter want of taste, moral and intellectual, rendered him of all speakers the least agreeable to a British audience. The same faults almost excluded him from good society. His wounded vanity and ambition drove him back to Ireland. To supply the funds necessary to feed or pay his sub-agitators he invented the rent. To obtain a further means of power, he supported the Melbourne administration. As a bond for his party he selected repeal—an object unattainable, and therefore not to be worn out like emancipation." This passage, it will be observed, combines with Mr. Senior's fine idea the view subsequently attributed to Lord Rosse. This is not the place to attempt a survey of O'Connell's career except in so far as is absolutely

necessary to exhibit what a cantankerous and unscrupulous critic Mr. Senior was. To say that O'Connell failed in Parliament is an assertion simply preposterous. His great contemporaries and antagonists would be the first to repel such an outrage on history. It would have been all but an impossibility for O'Connell to have failed, where human speech was the weapon, and human affairs the stake, in any assembly of articulate-speaking men. One towards whom he once used words that certainly were ungentle, but who was too generous to remember them on such an occasion—one peculiarly qualified to estimate Parliamentary greatness—Mr. Disraeli has recorded in words memorable and very touching the last appearance of O'Connell in the House. The passage is from the "Life of Lord George Bentinck":—

He sat in an unusual place—in that generally occupied by the leader of the opposition—and spoke from the red box, convenient to him from the number of documents to which he had to refer. His appearance was of great debility, and the tones of his voice were very still. His words, indeed, only reached those who were immediately around him, and the ministers sitting on the other side of the green table, and listening with that interest and respectful attention which became the occasion. It was a strange and touching spectacle to those who remembered the form of colossal energy, and the clear and thrilling tones that had once startled, disturbed, and controlled senates. Mr. O'Connell was on his legs for nearly two hours, assisted occasionally in the management of his documents by some devoted aide-de-camp. To the House generally it was a performance in dumb show, a feeble old man muttering before a table; but respect for the great Parliamentary personage kept all as orderly as if the fortunes of a party hung upon his rhetoric; and though not an accent reached the gallery, means were taken that next morning the country should not lose the last and not the least interesting of the speeches of one who had so long occupied and agitated the mind of nations.

Posterity will probably prefer on such a point the evidence of Mr. Disraeli to the evidence of Mr. Senior. As to O'Connell's supposed still more stinging failure in society, the real reason why he began the Repeal agitation, what is to be said? Was it in general deportment, or the turning of *bons-mots*, or only at short whist, or in dancing that he failed? O'Connell probably thought, with Sir George Lewis, that the world would be a very endurable place were it not for its pleasures—meaning specifically the pleasures of society. We must wait for "Mrs. Grundy's Memoirs," "The Autobiography of a Lady Patroness of Almack's," "The Diary of a Duchess in the reign of William IV.," and other forthcoming works of fashion, to test this point. British society to Mr. Senior



meant probably, in the first place, the society with which Mr. Senior mixed, and in which, let us suppose, he succeeded. We admit it is as difficult to conceive O'Connell succeeding in that set as it is to conceive an Irish wolf-dog performing the tricks of a parlour poodle. Do men of his stamp care to what is called "succeed" in what is called "society"? Was Mr. Cobden a success in society? Is Mr. Bright? It is impossible to write their honoured names in this connection without recognising how much they both owed to the example and the political method of O'Connell. His great system of moral force agitation has indeed been far more fruitful in legislative benefits and political training to the English people than to the Irish. But in some respects O'Connell had superior advantages. He was a man of old, and, in the true sense of the word, noble family; and his appearance singularly befitted his genius and his rank. His power of personal fascination and adaptation was extraordinary; his manners distinguished (faulty, if at all, towards complaisance); his humour exuberant and genial. If such qualities do not succeed in society, so much the worse for the society in which they fail. The real difficulty is to conceive O'Connell caring for such success, unless in so far as it came in his way, and could not fairly be avoided. Mr. Senior's other statements are flagrant fictions, which it is hardly worth while to contradict. What he calls "the rent" existed long before O'Connell entered Parliament. O'Connell supported Lord Melbourne's administration rather than Sir Robert Peel's, for precisely the same reasons that Irish Catholics now support Mr. Gladstone rather than Mr. Disraeli. He was a Repealer from the moment the Union was carried. He spoke in that sense, if once, a hundred times before the Clare election; and he introduced the question to Parliament, in one of the most remarkable of his speeches, ten years before he commenced the great agitation, of which Mr. Senior was actually writing.

It would be a weary task to expose the ignorant and scandalous calumnies against the Catholic Church and the Irish priesthood with which almost every page of Mr. Senior's *Journal* abounds. It would be difficult to believe that he believed many of the things that he puts upon paper, were it not that the book has obtained, and still continues to obtain, a reception from well-informed critics, never qualified by a syllable of doubt or censure. On all matters connected with religion, even the most interesting historical and literary questions, Mr. Senior appears to have been profoundly ignorant. This is a passage from a conversation with Archbishop Whately:—

"What is Thomas à Kempis's book, 'De Imitatione Christi?' " I asked.

"It is a misnomer," he answered. "It is a very pious, very dull book, a dialogue between Christ and the Soul, and contains only a few passages really on the imitation of Christ."

Here Dr. Whately's inability to comprehend the beauty and depth of a Christian classic is hardly so strange as Mr. Senior's blank ignorance of a book itself so famous, and the cause of one of the most curious of literary controversies.

In the same conversation Mr. Senior says—

Every Roman Catholic is a polytheist. When a Roman Catholic, praying to the Virgin, says, *Monstra te esse matrem*, he puts her, in fact, above God.

Any Roman Catholic who has had much acquaintance with Protestants must have remarked, that in proportion to a Protestant's difficulty of stating in a clear and definite form what he himself believes, is his confidence that he knows what a Catholic believes better than the Catholic himself can possibly know. But it may be simply said of this particular passage that the difficulty is to get a Roman Catholic's intellect to comprehend how his saying to our Blessed Lady, "Show that you are a Mother," puts her, in fact, above God Almighty.

Romish sanctity, says Archbishop Whately, is essentially and ostentatiously ascetic. It differs from that of a Hindoo fakeer only in degree.

The life of St. Francis de Sales, or St. Vincent de Paul, differs from that of a Hindoo fakeer only in degree!

Whole pages of the book are studded with equally grotesque absurdities; but, after all, these are its venial offences. Some of the charges against the character of the Irish priesthood are of a different order, and give us deep cause to lament the posthumous publication of the book, which renders it impossible to bring their authors to public account. The most shocking of these statements are attributed to Archbishop Whately, and such a one as follows is a sad revelation at once of his gross credulity and his reckless malignity. It concerns the conduct of the Irish priests during the famine :—

Their incomes were spent during the famine, as they were spent before it, and as they are now spent, on themselves, or hoarded until they could be employed in large subscriptions to chapels or convents. And this was not the worst. In some cases they refused to those who could not or who would not pay for them, the sacraments of their Church. In ordinary times this may be excusable. A clergy unendowed and unsalaried must be supported by

voluntary contributions, or by dues. In so poor a country as Ireland, voluntary contributions cannot be relied on. The priest might often starve if he did not exact his dues, and as he has no legal rights, his only mode of exacting them is to make their payment the condition on which his ministrations are performed. But during the famine payment was often obviously impossible. When under such circumstances the sacraments, which the priest affirmed to be necessary passports to heaven were refused, the people could not avoid inferring either that the priest let men sink into eternal torment to avoid a little trouble to himself, or that absolution or extreme unction could not be essential to salvation.

It is almost impossible to a Catholic to conceive any priest under any circumstances, except deliberate impenitence, refusing absolution to a dying man—but above all, we may venture to say, an Irish priest. The tender wisdom of the Church restores to the fallen and degraded priest the full plenitude of his jurisdiction for that supreme moment, and binds him to its exercise. The authority of the Church, on the other hand, would promptly smite the priest who was known to be guilty of such a shocking scandal as is here alleged, with at the least suspension from the cure of souls. Dr. Whately tells Mr. Senior that the practice was so common that it produced a certain effect on the mind of “the people.” Every Irish Catholic, especially every Irish Catholic who remembers the period of the famine, will, we are sure, agree with us in repelling such a statement as a malignant outrage against the known truth. We are not concerned to claim all the virtues under the sun for the Irish priesthood; but if there be one which, like the eminent purity of their morals, has been always traditional, characteristic, and, as it were, instinctive to them, it is their devotion to the dying. A “sick call” is a summons to the Irish priest with which there is no parley. Distance, weather, night, contagion, his own ailments or fatigue are pleas of no avail—he seems to share for the time the agony of the dying, and can know no rest until his tender ministry has smoothed the passage of the parting soul. To think of his dues at such a moment would be against his very nature. Ordinary Protestants are not aware that there are no dues attaching to the administration of absolution or extreme unction,—that dues are rather connected with the public and festive ceremonies of the Church, like baptism and marriage. But Dr. Whately is no more to be excused for the ignorance of such a series of statements as he made to Mr. Senior concerning the practice of the Catholic Church in Ireland—a practice which, if he believed in his function there to the extent that he professed, he was bound to understand

accurately before he spoke so confidently—than Cardinal Cullen would be justified in telling an Italian traveller, about to produce a book on Ireland, that the Irish Protestants annually immolated a Papist infant on the first of July to the shade of William III.

We may pass the passages relating to the conversion of Ireland to Protestantism, which was supposed in Dr. Whately's circle to be imminent when Mr. Senior visited Ireland in 1852. Even before the census of 1861 disposed of that fond and costly illusion, Dr. Whately had learned to doubt what he was in the habit of hearing on the subject. "For some time," Mr. Senior writes in his diary of 1852, "a considerable conversion to Protestantism has been going on in Ireland. The converts are to be numbered by thousands, not by hundreds." When Dr. Whately revised this passage, he inserted in italics the significant words "*it is said*" in the last sentence, after the word "numbered." That he believed that the national system of education would ultimately prove fatal to the Catholic faith in Ireland—that he was determined to use his considerable influence in its direction to this end, the reader of his memoirs may be already aware. Speaking to Mr. Senior on the subject, he more than once expressed himself in this way:—

Though the priest may still perhaps denounce the Bible collectively, as a book dangerous to the laity, he cannot safely object to the Scripture extracts which are read to children with the sanction of the prelates of his own Church. But these extracts contain so much that is inconsistent with the whole spirit of Romanism that it is difficult to suppose that a person well acquainted with them can be a thorough-going Roman Catholic.

This ludicrous delusion appears to have pervaded the Archbishop's circle. A Mr. C., a Dublin lawyer, says, in much the same strain:—

Archbishop Murray was a sincere believer in the peculiarities of his faith. Thinking them true, he thought they would be diffused and strengthened by the diffusion of knowledge. If he had not thought so, he would not have given the sanction of the Board to Archbishop Whately's "Christian Evidences," a book decidedly anti-Roman Catholic, since it founds belief on reason, not on mere authority. His successors are less confident. They have forced the withdrawal of the "Christian Evidences," and I have no doubt that they will get rid as far as they can of the common religious instruction.

It is useless, of course, to comment on the astounding assertion, uttered quite as a notorious commonplace, that the priest is in the habit of denouncing the Bible collectively as a book dangerous

to the laity—useless also to dwell on the irresistible conclusion that reading a little Scripture once a day at school must inevitably turn all the rising generation of Irish Catholics into Protestants. It does not appear to have had that effect. For nineteen centuries Catholics have been in the habit of reading much more of the Scriptures than is contained in the lessons of the Irish National Board, at Mass, at Vespers, in the various offices of the Church, without becoming Protestant. But this is a point upon which the Protestant intellect, after a little exercise in Ireland, appears to become incurably idiotic. Can honest Protestants, however, wonder at the deep distrust and keen suspicion with which the infliction of a system of mixed education is regarded by the Catholics of Ireland, when they are aware that, notwithstanding the most liberal professions, the system was thus designedly used by one of its principal authorities, with a distinct proselytizing purpose? This is the kind of conduct that Protestants would call “Jesuitical” conduct if they could find a Catholic archbishop engaged in it. The grand result of the system, however, so far as it is really a mixed system, has been to spread, not Protestantism, but Fenianism. The Irish Establishment is not consoled for her impending severance from the State by a noble army of neophytes, who found the logic of Whately’s “Christian Evidences” irresistible: but we have unfortunately, on the other hand, on Lord Mayo’s authority, the suggestive fact, that more national schoolmasters were arrested under the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act than there were proportionately of any other class or occupation in Ireland.

We lay down these volumes with a feeling, we confess, which is akin to despair. The information and the opinions which they contain are those which an enlightened Englishman had, from long reflection and sedulous inquiry, formed as to the state of Ireland and the character of the Irish people. They appear to be in course of general acceptance by English public opinion as a sort of political gospel on Ireland. “The work will enable England to understand Ireland as she has never done before,” says a great quarterly organ of opinion. “These volumes will, in our opinion, do more to make Englishmen comprehend Ireland, to explain Irish difficulties, and to throw light upon Irish questions, than any book that has ever been published about that much misunderstood country and that very perplexing people.” So speaks a great daily organ of opinion. We, on the other hand, deliberately believe that the account of the Irish nation, its character and circumstances, which Mr. Senior has drawn, is at least as far

from the truth, as dangerous to the State, as calculated to work on the worst passions of the two countries, as the most outrageous caricature of England and the English that Fenian animosity ever produced. And there is an acrid and cold-blooded malignity in it, besides, which is wanting to the racy, home-spun language of Celtic sedition. The English wonder at the extraordinary pleasure which the Irish undoubtedly take in the literature of their national press, a literature of invective against the English character, English laws, English institutions; of sympathy with every power on the face of the earth that is hostile to England. But, as Napoleon said, "there is nothing that one nation hates like another nation"; and the avidity with which Mr. Senior's book is accepted as an authentic expression of the true theory that Englishmen ought to hold about Ireland is as much an evidence of the blindness and bitterness of national animosity as is Fenianism. That theory, roughly stated, is that the Irish are a nation of polytheists, assassins, and Yahoos. The reception which such a book meets with raises this question, which goes to the bottom of every other: How is it possible that two nations should remain united, which appear, after a connection of seven hundred years, to be more incapable of understanding each other than they were at first? The *Topography of Giraldus Cambrensis* was not, we are convinced, so far astray from the truth regarding Ireland and the Irish in the twelfth century as Mr. Senior's book is from the truth of nowadays. The animosities which the book of the Welsh Dean produced between the two nations were fierce and active four hundred years after he had been laid in his grave. We will not predict for Mr. Senior so long a spell of posthumous strife. But we firmly believe that if his most characteristic views should come to be believed and acted on by the English nation in regard to the Irish, the era upon which we are now entering would not be one of hope and reconciliation, but one of increasing animosity and eventual separation.

---

## ART. II.—THEORIES ON DEVELOPMENT OF THE FAITH.

*The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ; Eight Lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1866, on the Foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury.* By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, M.A., student of Christ Church, Prebendary of Salisbury, and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury. Second edition. London : Rivingtons.

*An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, Author of Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church. London : Toovey.

*Katholische Dogmatik.* Von Dr. J. KUHN, ordentlicher Professor der Theologie zu Tübingen. Tübingen : Laupp. 1859–1862–1867.

THE Act by which Pius IX. defined the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is as remarkable for its effects on Theology as for its immediate contents ; and amongst them not the least noteworthy is its influence on the theory of development. To some thinkers on the subject, that great doctrine seemed to require and to authorize the laxest and the broadest theory in order to extract it from the Fathers. We have known Catholics who considered that the Immaculate Conception was unknown to S. John, and had been by some process or other discovered by the later Church. The Bull *Ineffabilis* has put an end for ever to such views as this. It declares that that great doctrine was a part of the original deposit, that it was in vigour from the most ancient times, that it always existed in the Church, was received from our predecessors in the faith, and has upon it the stamp of a revealed doctrine. The Bull, however, does more than this. It refers to the view of Vincent of Lerins as to the growth of doctrine ; and it uses the word *explicare*, which, at least since the time of St. Thomas,\* has become the technical word for development.†

---

\* Summa 22 Qu. 1. a. 7.

† Hanc "Catholica Ecclesia . . . . *tanquam doctrinam possidens divinitus acceptam et cœlestis revelationis deposito comprehensam*, multiplici continenter ratione splendidisque factis magis in dies *explicare*, proponere, et fovere nun-



The effect of all this is twofold. First it throws us back upon the Fathers. Curiously enough, the lax views about development to which we have adverted are by no means confined to the liberalist school. Some who are most loyal to the Church, from the very fact of their firm hold on the doctrine of the all-sufficiency for practical purposes of the present Church, have been apt to forget that by the very terms of the Catholic Faith we are as much bound to the past as to the present. It is our glory and our strength that we have never changed. As we are the Church of the present and the future, so we are the Church of the past. We are just as much obliged to yield internal assent to the dogmatic decisions of a dead Pope as of a living one. For us the Pope never dies, and S. Leo's Letter to S. Flavian is as binding and irreversible as the Bull "*Ineffabilis*." We are like soldiers who have to defend a grand empire with a world-wide frontier. If it be pierced at any one point, it receives a mortal wound. Let it be made out that a single Pope *ex cathedrâ* taught what is untrue, our cause is lost at once. It is quite true, that while all Christians outside the Church are turning melancholy eyes towards the darkness of the past to interrogate Antiquity on the origin of Christianity, and are trembling lest their faith should turn out to be baseless, the simple believer, on the contrary, feels secure in the living Church. But the theologian is not a simple believer, or rather, he is something more. For the ordinary purposes of the pulpit and the confessional it would be well if all knew accurately one great divine, such as Suarez; but he cannot be a perfect theologian who knows nothing of the treasures of Christian antiquity. How can he estimate the *sensus communis* of theologians unless he knows the Fathers? It would be well if all remembered the dictum of a learned Jesuit, whose mind is as broad as his loyalty to the Church is great. "In passing judgment on particular cases, a man must avoid two extremes. On the one hand he must not too lightly pin his faith on pronouncements that this or that is *sententia communis* or *communissima*. For some too easily make the assertion because they only know the theologians of their own time, their own country, or their own order. On the other hand, a man must not be too captious; some few theologians swimming against the stream do not

---

*quam destitit.*" So teaches the Bull "*Ineffabilis*." The "*Æterni Patris*," which summons the coming Council, speaks perhaps even more significantly. It declares that Councils have been called together from time to time "*ad Catholicam propugnandam, illustrandam, et evolvendam doctrinam.*" See our last number, p. 530.



break its resistless strength." \* His is but a shallow mind who can despise the study of the Fathers. The decision of Pius IX. is a fresh call to all who love the honour of Mary, to look the matter in the face, and to study the idea formed of her by the great theologians of old.

The document which we are studying, however, has a second tendency, with which at present we are most concerned. By declaring that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was a part of the original deposit confided by the Apostles to the Church, the Pope has narrowed the circle of lawful theories of development. Of course, after all, the question is principally one of fact. Do or do not the Fathers of the first centuries teach clearly the whole doctrine of the Holy Trinity or the Immaculate Conception? How much do they teach implicitly and how much explicitly? Yet here, as in everything else connected with history, mechanical fact needs theory to help it. As in secular history, any writer, who should go on the assumption that man's will is not free, would be a bad historian, so in telling the grand tale of the fortunes of the Church, he would be sure to fail who lost sight of the great truth that the facts of Christianity are dogmatic. We have therefore a deep suspicion of all writers on development who make a pomp of being purely and fearlessly historical. There is a school amongst us dry, spiritless, and barren, who profess to give us simple facts, without paying attention to ecclesiastical theories. They forget that development itself is a theory to account for facts, and, like all theories, it has a double office; it must conform itself to the facts of the case, while it interprets them, and at the same time it must be consonant with religion and with ethics. It is equally a failure, if it is faithless to either of its duties. Nay, if it is faithless to one, it is sure to be false to both, since both the Faith and the facts are true. It is plain then that a theory of development may be false on two counts; it may not fit the phenomena of the case, or it may be wrong in doctrine. It is plain that there are certain theories which may be condemned at once, as soon as stated, either as plainly against known facts or against the Christian Faith. Our object in this article is by the examination of various theories which have been put forward, to clear the way for approximating to something like a right theory on this momentous subject. Our task is a very humble one, for we shall make unlimited use of the labours of previous thinkers. But we are the rather desirous to lose no time in expressing ourselves on the subject, because F. Bottalla, S.J., has ex-

---

\* Schneemann, *Die Kirchliche Lehrgewalt*.

pressed an intention—after he has brought out his forthcoming volume on infallibility—of treating the whole question which concerns “Catholic teaching in its true origin and real development.” We shall be very glad to obtain F. Bottalla’s judgment on the truth and value of the present view, as far as it goes. We will begin by two extreme opinions, which will at once enable the reader to estimate how deeply the question of development is rooted in the very first principles of Christianity, and how it is connected with the profoundest problems which have ever occupied the human mind.

Long have we waited for a sign from Oxford to indicate that F. Newman’s book on Development had even reached its intellect. One fault of the book is its excellence; it was too profound to be effective against Anglicans. It was, to use the words of its author, like sending an army to arrest a house-breaker. Dr. Pusey still goes on complacently talking about the Fathers, as if his interpretation were the right and the only one. Will he ever before the day of doom open his eyes to the patent fact of his monstrous exercise of private judgment upon them? His view of the Fathers is directly opposed to that of the Roman Church, the Constantinopolitan Greek Church, the Slavonian Church of Russia, and of every other of those bodies which he considers to be Churches, all of which consistently anathematize him; without reckoning the curses both loud and deep of his own communion.

A man whose intellect and conscience are not stirred by this, may sit calmly under F. Newman’s logic. At length, however, we have an attempt on the part of Mr. Liddon to neutralize the facts, fatal to Anglicanism, by treating the differences between the Fathers on the subject as mere differences of intellectual expression arising from differences of time. The writers of the fourth century, it seems, clothed in the language of the period the self-same doctrine which S. Justin expressed in the language of his time. He uses this assertion for a polemical purpose, in order to draw a contrast between the definition of the Immaculate Conception and the definition of the Homousion by the Council of Nicæa. The former he calls a new dogma, the latter a matter of “expression.” We do not wonder at his attempt; to an Anglican who thinks at all (and Mr. Liddon’s book is full of thought), the fact of real discrepancies between the early Fathers, and of a subsequent contrary definition at Nicæa, is death, as he full well must know. The Fathers alone are not a standard of faith, if they need the Church to interpret them.

Mr. Liddon’s position then is this: “The Apostles taught our Lord’s Divinity, but did not teach the Immaculate Con-

ception. Hence, the broad contrast between the two above-named definitions." But we are here referring not to the general dogma of our Lord's Divinity, but to the particular *analysis* of that dogma which was virtually defined at Nicæa. We ask Mr. Liddon this simple question: did the Apostles, or did they not, teach that particular doctrinal analysis? To say that they did *not*, would be to admit that very thesis which Mr. Liddon so strenuously denies; viz., that the Church of a later century can define what the Apostles never taught. He must say, therefore—and so far we heartily agree with him—that the Apostles did teach, not merely the general dogma of our Lord's Divinity, but that particular analysis of the dogma which is symbolized by the word *ὁμοούσιον*. Yet so soon as he admits this, the whole ground is taken from under his feet when he would argue that the Apostles did not teach the Immaculate Conception. "How can the Apostles have taught this dogma!" exclaims the Anglican, "when S. Thomas and the Dominican Order denied it in the thirteenth century? It must be a new dogma, when such a man as the Angelical Doctor did not believe it." To this it is a perfectly sufficient answer to say that on the same ground the Anglican ought to consider the Consubstantiality of the Divine Word to be a new dogma framed at Nicæa. We assert that there is the same evidence for thinking that the Apostles did not teach the *ὁμοούσιον* as that they did not teach the Immaculate Conception. The cases are exactly parallel. In neither case does the disbelief of some individual doctors prove that the Church had not from the first received it. When a Christian doctrine is in question, four centuries of unbelief are as fatal as thirteen. The Alexandrian school denied the *ὁμοούσιον*, as the Dominican denied the Immaculate Conception. Why is the former fact not fatal at once to the early belief of the Church? Because the Church received it, though individuals denied it. The comparison holds good in very minute particulars. As S. Dionysius undoubtedly held our Lord to be God, yet held that there was a time when He was becoming something which He was not before; so S. Thomas, though he knew Mary to be the Mother of God, yet imagined a brief interval of time when the stain of original sin was on her. Curiously enough, S. Dionysius, and perhaps even Origen, contradicted himself, and does use the term "Consubstantial" of our Lord, and some have defended him on that ground: on the same ground of self-contradiction it has been asserted that S. Thomas held the Immaculate Conception. We hope to show that they can be defended on other grounds, but in any case difficulties and their solution are the same, and are equally

fatal to Mr. Liddon. On one ground, and one alone, can he attempt to get off;—that of asserting that in the case of the Council of Nicæa the doctrine defined differed only in words from that before expressed by Origen and certain other writers. He could hardly have made a more perilous assertion.

Of all the Fathers of four centuries, Mr. Liddon must needs pitch upon Origen to show that the doctrine of the ante-Nicene theologians was only a “different aspect of the truth” defined at Nicæa. Now we have on many grounds and in many respects, as we have often expressed, a sincere veneration for Origen’s memory; and it must never be forgotten that he wrote at a period when the doctrine defined at Nicæa had, at all events, not been promulgated throughout the Church. But if words mean anything at all, if in any sense they stand for thoughts, Origen’s difference from that doctrine was not a difference of philosophical language, but a difference of conception. When Origen uses the miserable expression of the “first God,” speaking of the Father, he did not mean what the Apostle meant by the expression “One God and Father of all, who is above all;” for the Apostle calling Him One God would not have excluded the Son, while Origen, in calling the first God not only implicitly but explicitly calls the Son “the second God.”\* Origen did not “implicitly mean that, independently of all time and inferiority, the Son’s life was derived from, and, *in that sense*, subordinate to the life of the Father.” He meant it in quite another sense. That according to Origen there was no inferiority in time, we are quite aware; for Origen’s speculative system required the eternity of the Son, and he was no Arian: but a real inferiority there was on another count. We will even allow, what is very doubtful, that the passages in which he uses the *ὁμοούσιον* are genuine. This would only prove that he did not understand the term, and that Origen the speculative theologian was not as orthodox as Origen the simple believer. Let us remember that his system was a scientific explanation of the difficulty raised, not only by Monarchianism, but by the Faith itself. If the Son is at once One with the Father, and different from the Father, in what is He One and in what is He different? To this the answer that He is two because derived from the Father is true, but insufficient. The question remains, in what is He One? The Nicene answer is that the difference wholly regards the Person, but that in Essence they are simply

---

\* Kuhn. iii. 228.

identical. In other words, the Son is the Absolute Monas, precisely as the Father is. This was exactly what Origen denied. His answer to the Noetians is that the Son differs from the Father in that He is the relative, while the Father is the Absolute God. Whether Origen was a material heretic, whether what he had in his mind was heresy, is quite another matter; but that what he says, that the objective meaning of his words is not what the Fathers of Nicæa said, is perfectly plain. He thus, for instance, comments on S. John:—

When the expression Θεός is used of the ingenerate Cause of All, he prefixes the article, ὁ Θεός; when, however, it is used of the Logos, it is without the article. In like manner, ὁ Λόγος is to be used of the being who is the author of reason to rational creatures, while for those who possess reason by derivation from Him, the article must be omitted. This distinction resolves the difficulty which troubles many who in their piety tremble lest they should be Ditheists, but nevertheless have fallen into false dogmas which are contrary to piety. They either deny that the Subsistence (ιδιότης) of the Son is different from that of the Father, and think that the Son of God is only another name for God himself; or they deny the Godhead of the Son, and think that the Subsistence, the particular Being of the Son, is foreign to the Father.\* To these persons we must say, that in the one case, God is the Absolute God (Ἀυτόθεος) as Christ himself says in His prayer to the Father “That they may know Thee, the only true God.” But whatever beside the Father is made God through participation in His Godhead, cannot be called the God, but only a God. This name belongs especially to the First-born of all creation, who as and the first in the companionship of God, received the Godhead in himself, and is much higher than the other gods whose God is the God, because He made them gods. The true God then is the God; and those who are made gods after His form are images of the Prototype. On the other hand, the Logos who is with God stands to these copies in the relation of archetypal Image; He is God for the very reason that He was with God in the beginning, and remains God, which He would not be unless He continued in unending contemplation of the Father’s Infinity.†

This is but one passage among many which show as plainly as language can speak that Origen’s theory to account for the Oneness of the Father and the Son, combined with their difference, in other words, his conception, was not that of Nicæa. Further on, Mr. Liddon substitutes for what we have quoted from him a very safe but very different sentence: “As a matter

---

\* Τὴν ιδιότητα καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν κατὰ περιγραφὴν τυγχάνουσιν ἑτέραν τοῦ Πατρὸς. What Origen means by οὐσία κατὰ περιγραφὴν is a nature in an individual. The Artemonist section of the Monarchians, against whom he is aiming, thought that not only our Lord’s Person, but His nature was human.

† In Joan, tom. ii. 2.

of fact the Nicene fathers only affirmed, in the philosophical language of the fourth century, what our Lord and the Apostles had taught in the popular dialects of the first." This no Catholic will deny, either of the *ὁμοούσιον*, or of the Immaculate Conception. It was no accretive development, as Mr. Liddon calls it, to the Apostles. Nay, we will go further, the Consubstantiality of the Word was no such development to S. Irenæus, to S. Callistus, or S. Dionysius of Rome; but it was an accretive development to Origen and S. Dionysius of Alexandria: as was the Immaculate Conception to S. Bernard and S. Thomas, and as it was not to S. Hippolytus, S. Ephrem, and S. Anselm, or to any Pope who sat on the throne of S. Peter.

There is but one hypothesis on which words as plain as those of Origen and the letter of his disciple S. Dionysius against the Sabellians can be made to have the same meaning as the definition of Nicæa; that is, that they both mean nothing. If theological terms do not stand for thoughts, but are mere words, of the sense of which the human intellect can form no conception whatsoever, then the author, who calls Christ "a second God," may mean neither more nor less than the Fathers, who decree that He is Consubstantial with the Father. In his last lecture we are glad to admit that Mr. Liddon has spoken of the inferences to be drawn from theology in terms which are inconsistent with the hypothesis which we are contemplating. He ought to have seen that this view, which he uses with such force against his opponents, prevents the Immaculate Conception of our Lady from being a new dogma. We are, however, at this moment concerned with the theory of development; and so certainly is this hypothesis, viz. the unmeaningness of theological terms—at the root of the view of those who, like Mr. Liddon, deny any real development, that there is nothing extraordinary in the assertion that it underlies his language, and was at the very least latent in his mind, even though he would not consciously accept it. It is very unpleasant to hear him speak of the decisions of Nicæa, "adding to the sum of *authoritative ecclesiastical language*." Did not the Council impose a conception, a mode of thinking of the Holy Trinity, as well as a term or mode of expressing it? The words which we have printed in italics remind us but too forcibly of a theory propounded by another Bampton lecturer.

All this is the more significant when we remember that in 1858, in the same pulpit of S. Mary's, from which so much has issued during the last thirty years, another preacher has propounded in distinct terms the very theory of the impossi-



bility of development which we are now considering. His intention was to set a limit to irreligious thought, by showing that all thought on religion was a physical impossibility to man ; with what success experience has since shown. During the last ten eventful years in Oxford, thought has progressed with fearful strides. The theory which was intended to set bounds to it was expressed in no ambiguous terms.

The conclusion which an examination of the conditions of human thought unavoidably forces upon us is this : there can be no such thing as a positive science of speculative theology ; for such a science must necessarily be based on an apprehension of the Infinite ; and the Infinite, though we are compelled to believe in its existence, cannot possibly be apprehended in any mode of the human consciousness. The same impediment which prevents the formation of theology as a science, is also manifestly fatal to the theory which asserts its progressive development. We can test the progress of knowledge only by comparing its successive representations with the objects which they profess to represent ; and as the object in this case is inaccessible to human faculties, we have no criterion by which to distinguish progress and mere fluctuation. The so-called progress in theology is in truth only an advance in those conceptions of man's moral and religious duties which form the basis of natural religion ; an advance which is regulative, not speculative ; which is primarily a knowledge not of God's nature, but of man's obligation ; and which is the result not of an immediate intuition of the nature of the Infinite, but of a closer study of the laws of the Finite.\*

To some of the grounds of this view we shall afterwards recur ; but at this moment we only pause to notice that the conclusion is based upon a philosophical opinion which the author has expressed as follows :—“ All the various processes of thought may be referred to the single faculty of thought or reflection ; the operation of which is in all cases comparison. The unit of thought is always a judgment based on a comparison of objects ; and the several operations of thought are in ultimate analysis nothing more than judgments derived from different data.” From these premisses Dean Mansel has inferred that the human mind can have no conception whatever of an Infinite Being ; and that though we can believe in His existence by faith, yet faith is not an intellectual process at all, and no notion of Him is ever formed by our reason. “ The Absolute and the Infinite are thus like the Inconceivable and the Imperceptible, *names* indicating, not an object of thought or of consciousness at all, but the mere absence of the conditions under which consciousness

---

\* Dean Mansel's Bampton Lectures.

is possible." Nor is this only true of the abstract Infinite; but far more is it true of the concrete notion of an Infinite Being. A concrete Infinite is a contradiction; and Personality involves a further contradiction. The attempt to conceive it is "the suicide of Rationalism." We can only say that Dean Mansel's view is the suicide of Reason, and of something far more precious. He cures the headache by cutting off the head. He effectually destroys wild thoughts by blowing out his brains. The deadly sickness and vertigo of doubt is gone; but we have got instead of it intellectual death on all the grandest subjects which can occupy human thought. Let us go over the steps by which this miserable conclusion is reached. From the assumed fact that every idea is a judgment, he has inferred that the human mind is physically incapable of forming any real idea of God. Every judgment implies comparison, and what terms of comparison have we by which we can measure God? It implies limitation, and therefore the Being who is illimitable is utterly beyond its apprehension. It is essentially a relation, and therefore the Absolute is an unmeaning term. Above all, a judgment is by an inexorable necessity partial, while the Infinite is very Oneness without the possibility of parts. God must be apprehended wholly, or not apprehended at all. For this reason there are contradictions fatal and inevitable in the very notion of the Infinite. It is not an idea at all, since it is incapable of being included in a judgment. Now as to Dean Mansel's premisses, we say as little as possible; for we wish in this article to be as nearly as we can mere historians of views on development. But it is scarcely possible to speak too severely of the conclusion. If it be true, then God is to the human intellect a word symbolizing the want of thought. With perfect consistency the author applies his theory to the mysteries of the Faith. Theological terms are simply and absolutely conventional, conveying no idea whatsoever to the hearer, and implying none in the speaker. On such a view as this, development vanishes as a matter of course. That which has no sense is struck at once with barrenness. It can only bring forth wind. How can a man develop Abracadabra? But, then, what becomes of Revelation? What is the meaning of a Revelation which adds in no way whatsoever to the sum of human knowledge, which reveals nothing?

It is a portentous fact that a system such as this should have issued from Oxford. We do not accuse Dr. Pusey and his friends of having thought out all this. In general we may say that the process of thinking is foreign to their minds. We do say, however, that the whole of their tone falls in most



remarkably with the conclusion. They are ever systematically taking refuge in vagueness and in mist, and that on the ground of the irreverence of precision. They quarrel with the Tridentine definition of Transubstantiation, and retire into a vague Real Presence, utterly inadequate to convey the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Let them beware lest the Consubstantiality of the Divine Word should share the fate of the Blessed Sacrament, and become "scholastic language."

It is not, however, with these principally that we are now concerned. The examination of the above views already furnishes us with one absolutely necessary condition of a true development. It can only be exercised upon a thing really apprehended by the intellect, and all theories which do not provide for a knowledge of the object to be developed are at once to be regarded as faulty. Development is a process of reflection on an object previously seized by the thought. Nor does anything in the notion imply that that apprehension is small. It is requisite to bear this in mind, because some writers use terms which imply that the first steps in the process must be despicably small. Of course such expressions as germs and seeds are perfectly allowable; but if they are employed to exaggerate the imperfection of the beginnings of Christian theology, they are dangerous and false. The very peculiarity of Christian development is that the stream is broadest at its source. No theologian to the end of time will know more than the Apostles. Nay, there is nothing in the nature of the case to prevent the knowledge possessed by their immediate successors from being better in kind than that of subsequent theologians. This is historically borne out by the facts of the progress of Christian dogma. The enunciations of the earliest writers on our Lord's Godhead are more downright and unequivocal than those of the Fathers who followed them. Who ever found fault with S. Clement and S. Ignatius? It is with the Apologists that difficulties begin. So it is with Our Lady. The doctrine of S. Irenæus and of the author of the second Epistle to Diognetus is far higher than that of Origen.

The difficulties begin with Origen. Before him she is simply the second Eve, and is thus compared to one immaculate in the first moment of her existence. Of course development is an advance; but we must not be deceived by words, nor make a mistake as to that in which the advance consists. An object reaches our apprehension first as a whole. Subsequent knowledge splits into parts what at first was one. It sees difficulties, and it struggles to harmonize them. The time of

struggle may be inferior to the first impression until the harmony is found. Even the knowledge gained at last, while more extensive, may yet be less intense than the first. This will become more clear from the examination of the opposite extreme to that which we have hitherto been criticising.

A few years ago the consideration of the theory of which we are now to give an account would hardly have been a practical matter. We fear, however, that a fearful change has taken place. Even Dr. Pusey is terrified into an attempt to fraternize with dissenters, in order to escape the rationalism which has invaded even the common-rooms of Oxford; nor are we reassured because, in one of those curious semi-conscious parentheses, which often betray that a dim view of the reality has just sufficiently reached his mind to call forth a denial of it, he tells the Wesleyan Conference that rationalism is diminishing. May he be right! In the meanwhile it is certain that the shallow barrier set to rationalistic thought when first the tide was flowing, has been utterly overborne, and not so much submerged as swept away.

A view of development has become, at the very least, not uncommon, which, not long ago, was utterly unknown, and which, if known, would have found absolutely no response. Whether the view would be formalized precisely in the German way we have no means of knowing, yet we believe we do not calumniate Oxford when we say that something like the Hegelianism, which is no longer believed in Germany, finds many adherents there. We will state it in its native form, which we borrow from a Catholic writer, whose fairness is undoubted:—

Rationalism has fastened itself on the form in which the organs of the Christian revelation have expressed their religious consciousness in terms which suited their own time, and has drawn the conclusion from it that that expression could not possibly convey the Christian Truth to all time. This view, however, could not possibly stop short at the Apostles, it must ascend up to Christ Himself, who is in the same position as they. Accordingly it is said by Semler that the word spoken by Christ and His Apostles to the Jews and heathen could not be the standard for all times and all degrees of civilization, and that a distinction must be made between their doctrine and their mode of teaching, in the sense that the latter could not have an absolute value, since it was accommodated to the imagery of that time. Then much is said about the infinite developing power of Christianity, and about its aim, to make its truths fruitful for all following generations. Furthermore, it is argued that words could not be framed so as to contain the whole compass of the conceptions of Christianity, which were to progress in never-ending development. Of this development, which entered into the world with Christianity, the Apostolic writings form but the first shape, the

first link in a chain, the first and the most narrow of the concentric circles raised in the boundless ocean of thought by the flinging of Christian truth into it, the first impulse to the movement. The True and the Perfect is not to be found in the commencement but in the progress to the end. "The text of the Bible," says Hegel, "contains the mode of the first appearance of Christianity; this is what it describes, and such a description can only contain what is in the principle of Christianity, and even that not as yet in an express manner, but only a presentiment of it! What the spirit which reveals itself in Christianity is in and for itself (an und für sich) does not come out at first. One might almost say, when one leads back Christianity to its first appearance, it is reduced to the stage of vacancy of spirit (Geistlosigkeit)." Schelling speaks in the same sense. "The first books of the history and doctrine of Christianity are themselves nothing but a special, and therefore imperfect, appearance of it; its Idea is not to be found in them, and their worth is only to be estimated according to the degree in which this Idea is expressed in them." \*

This, however, only gives us, as yet, an imperfect view of the part played by development in Hegel's system. Christ and His Apostles are not only the first feeble beginning of Christianity, but that beginning does not, even in any real sense, contain the germ of future developments. Each step is a spring forward on the last: it does not properly spring out of it. This is apparent from the fact that in that system heresies are as much real developments as are Catholic verities. The truth lies in the very developing, in the movement, in the flux and the succession, in the contradictions reconciled at last by the knowledge to which the spirit attains that each is a necessary step in its life. The Christian notion that our Lord taught a grand body of truth once for all, of which all forms of doctrine are developments, and out of which they come without the least substantial change, is expressly denied and despised as dead, monotonous, lifeless, spiritless. Unambiguously, and without equivocation, it is laid down that each development must be a real, essential change upon the last, and that their substantial truth lies in their being all equally the spontaneous movement of the Absolute Idea, which struggles through them all into a consciousness of Self. So incredible does it appear that any one calling himself a Christian should hold this view, that we quote Kuhn's summary of the views of Dr. Baur, a Protestant professor of Tübingen, which are almost his own words:—

Dr. Baur distinguishes three modes of looking upon the process of the history of dogma: the first he calls that of the ecclesiastical belief; the

---

\* Kuhn, i. 132.

second that of subjective reason (the ordinary rationalistic); the third is that of the speculative criticism (Hegelianism). According to the first there is to be found, in the history of dogma, only a substantial matter, without that movement in which the life of history consists; according to the second, nothing but movement and change, without the substantial reality which is the kernel of historical movement. These two are but one-sided modes of viewing the question, and the one-sidedness can only be taken away by taking one's stand on the principle, according to which the historical movement is considered as the indispensable reconciliation of the matter (Inhalt) with itself, or as the objective self-movement of the Idea.

According to this view, there is no such thing as a heretic; heresy and orthodoxy are equally accounted for by the view that "the Spirit, filled and penetrated by the contents (Inhalt) of the absolute Idea, feels in itself the impulse to go out of itself, to project out of itself the objective contents of the Idea; to throw itself into its mould (sich in ihn hineinzubilden), to make itself an object to itself in it, in order to bring its contents to consciousness before itself according to its various moments."\* Those acquainted with Hegel will recognize at once the parentage of this sentence. A little consideration will make its meaning clear to an English reader.

Of course we have nothing to do with Hegelianism, except in as far as it is a Christian heresy, and as it bears on the question of development. A reference to old errors will make its purport plain.

In the original Arian view, God the Father, their only real God, was Incomprehensible in a peculiar way. In their theory He could hardly be said to be our Creator. In the very act of our creation we should have perished, for we could not bear His Almighty hand. It was their express theory that the Son was created to create us. The inexorable abyss, however, between God and man could not really be bridged by such a being as the Son. Like Semele in the pagan myth, He too ought to have been burnt up in the fiery splendour in giving birth to us. The consequence is, that the Arian God is not so much incomprehensible as unintelligible. He is the simple abstract notion of being, without enough of determination to have any attributes—not even sufficiently known to the human mind to enable it to see so much as contradictions in Him. Such was the early Arian God. Much later, however, in its history, the tactics changed, and veered round to the other extreme, which always lies in wait for a Unitarian God. Eunomius, in controversy with S. Basil, maintained that

---

\* *Theologische Quartalschrift*. Tübingen, 1850, p. 280.

God is perfectly within the compass of human comprehension. The real, essential notion of God, they argued, is that He is the Unbegotten. This exhausts Him as well as compasses Him. This is His Essence. The Son then being confessedly begotten, is not the Supreme God. Accidentally this verbal quibble opened up abysses of thought, of which probably Eunomius, himself was quite unconscious. The cold, slippery surface of icy logic all at once moved, yawned, and disclosed sudden unsuspected depths. It is evident that it was necessary to the argument of Eunomius that the term Unbegotten should be the whole, and therefore the only idea of God. It must exhaust His being. Otherwise, if there is any distinction in God, if there be composition in the notion of Him, this at once gives room for the Catholic answer:—"There are in God substantial predicates, and predicates which have to do only with the mode of His being. The Son has all the substantial predicates of Godhead; He is Eternal, Immutable, Infinite. To be Unbegotten, however, is only a predicate of the latter class—it is personal to the Father, and has to do with the mode of His being, with His hypostasis; not with His essence as God." Eunomius, in his rejoinder, at once denied the reality of these substantial attributes of God. Eternity, immutability, infinity, are mere words—names without any meaning—adding nothing whatsoever to the notion of Unbegotten, which alone is the Essence of God. If, he argued, they are more than mere names, if they are realities, if God has more than one attribute, then there are real distinctions in God.

It is curious how early the view of meaningless developments came into the Church, and how disreputable is its origin. The shallow reasoning of Eunomius, however, gave occasion to the Fathers to see more explicitly a momentous truth, which had never before come out so accurately in Christian thought. God is Incomprehensible: all our thoughts of Him are inadequate; nevertheless, human thoughts of Him are real, and represent real truth. We are compelled by the very constitution of our minds to split up into various concepts that Being who is very Oneness. Our understanding is so constructed, that absolute identity is nothing to us. That which is One we must look upon as Many; and this necessarily introduces negation into our notion of God, for multiplicity implies, in human minds at least, that one thing is not another. The concept of justice in God is other than the concept of mercy; though in reality both express the very substance of God, in which are no alternations, and in which each quality is but the substance itself. Yet let us beware

of supposing that justice and mercy in God are mere meaningless words, which are empty of contents, and do not stand for thoughts. They are a necessary part of our idea of God, and do express truth, though what that truth is, we only partially know. That there is a distinction between absolute and relative truth, and that that distinction does not brand the latter with falsehood, is well known to theology. Its strongest expression is the Scotist *Realis formalis distinctio* between the attributes of God; which has never been banished from the schools, though it has found but little favour there. It conveys at least the fact that the formality of God—that is the indispensable human thought of Him—without which He would become the empty abstract Absolute of logic—conveys reality. If it were not real, theology would become impossible. It is inadequate, but true. There is a strange mixture of the subjective and objective in it. Nay, that the notion of Infinite Being is not to us an empty term, but has a real, positive function in us, is proved by the fact that it corrects the inadequacy of the multiplicity of our conceptions. When we look upon God as a collection of attributes, we know that we are wrong. No sooner do we posit multiplicity, than we take it away. Negation is only affirmed to be denied. We never rest a moment in the numerous contradictions into which we are landed by speculations on God. An irresistible force pushes us beyond, and we transcend them; and that force is a dim view of His Absoluteness, which lies under all relative thought; for how should we know that it was relative, if an anticipation of its correlative, the Absolute, did not force us on? There is a marvellous mixture of strength and impotence in human thought, and it is the movement resulting from the combination which we call development. Because the grand object of theology is Infinite, and because we have an apprehension of it, we never rest without seeking to harmonize our knowledge. Because we are weak, and our apprehension is inadequate, succession is a condition of advance.

It is most curious to see what at once a denial, and yet a strange caricature of these truths, is exhibited in Hegel. That which an obscure heretic in the fourth century started more in order to puzzle the doctors of the Church than from a real insight into the question, was carried out by Hegel boldly and inexorably to its utmost conclusion. We have seen that Eunomius asserted that one conception of God, that is, the thought of Him as the Unbegotten, was absolutely true. In other words, it is not the truth relatively to our faculties and coloured by them, so that, without ceasing to be true, it is inadequate; but it is a knowledge of God as He is in Himself, and



therefore absolutely true. Hegel affirms this of all thought. The Absolute is thought and human thought. Beyond that there is no Incomprehensible, for there is nothing to comprehend. By thought of course he did not mean your thought or mine, but he did mean the laws of man's thought erected into the universal reason. In this way he got rid for ever of the question—why should the laws of thought be the laws of things? Thought is the universe. Bearing this in mind, we can understand why Hegel's system must be one of development, and why the very principle of that development is one of contradiction, in which each step forward must be the negation of its predecessor. This being the case, of course Christianity must develop, and must include in itself substantial change; thus what we call heresy is in reality an indispensable phase of truth. It is plain that, unless, like Eunomius, we take one abstract thought to be the absolute, and arbitrarily exclude all others except as far as they are identical with it, such a system as Hegel's must produce contradiction. If human thought is absolute truth, and if the laws of its logic are the laws of all intellect and all being, then the very contradictions which arise from the imperfection of our faculties are raised to the dignity of necessary phases of truth. Let any one look in the face the many problems involved in such elementary notions as Space, Time, or Matter, he will find himself bewildered with difficulties, from which he will take refuge in the thought of the inadequacy of his intellect to cope with truth, and thus find a reason for declaring that contradictions are only apparent. This refuge is cut off from Hegel, and accordingly in the Hegelian, "space is unity, and space is plurality, space is identity, and space is difference, space is limitation, and space is illimitation. And as it is with space so it is with time." Much more is this the case with that idea which, after all, alone concerns us here,—the human thought of God. A Christian theologian knows that God is One, yet he is forced by the very constitution of his mind to consider Him as One Substance with many qualities. Nor is this a difficulty to him, because he knows that the Oneness alone is the absolute truth, while the multiplicity is only the truth in relation to his imperfect powers, and therefore inadequately conceived. Such a solution, however, is neither desired by, nor possible to Hegel. If all the thoughts of the human intellect with respect to God are true, then contradiction penetrates into the very substance of God. He is both One and Many, Simple and Composite, Infinite and Finite. We need not say that this principle does not stop with God; it is made to account for the existence of all creation. Thus the universe becomes

a gigantic system of development, in which the contradictions of human thought are turned into the cause of things, and into so many steps in the evolution of being. In the most rigorous manner the genesis of things is made to correspond to the genesis of thought. "Go down," says the Hegelian, "to the primal element of all thought, you will find that all springs from the idea of abstract Being. As, however, this primal notion is an absolute void, and utterly without attributes, it must evidently become the very contrary to itself, that is, Nothing, before it can be productive and pass into any real existence. In other words, the original vast illimitable Being must limit itself by Nothingness before it can bring any special thing into existence. Is not Nothing becoming Something the very idea of creation?" Thus contradiction, which is the law which directs the spontaneous movement of the inner dialectics of thought, also presides over creation, or to speak more properly over the transition by which the One passes into the Many. This is the first stage in the great series of the development at once of conceptions and of things. Being, Nothing, Becoming is the first group of human thoughts, the beginning of that endless chain, each link of which is a triad of terms, two of which contradict each other, and are reconciled by a third.

Is all this nonsense, as Lockhart is said to have pronounced it to be, with the addition of a common English expletive which would hardly be seemly in the pages of the DUBLIN REVIEW? We fear it is not nonsense, but something worse; it is very definite sense on condition of its being blasphemy. We have not yet reached the term of the development. In contradictions no man can rest, and even a Hegelian must find some means of introducing harmony into the wild discords of reasoning to which we have been listening. When a Christian theologian meets with what looks like a contradiction, he never acquiesces in it as the absolute truth. It is to him a healthful warning that his intellect after all is an imperfect instrument, and that the analogical reasoning which he is applying to Incomprehensible things has come to its limit. A Hegelian, however, is bound to discover that the contradictions represent some actual truth, or to relinquish his principle that thought and thing are absolutely identical. He at once accounts for and reconciles them by asserting that they represent a real process in the life of God. Their very movement is His life. He too must needs be subject to the law by which an intellectual being can only attain to full consciousness by making Himself an object of reflection, and turning His own thoughts upon himself. This, it is argued, He cannot do



without abandoning His own simplicity. By this very act multiplicity is introduced into His inmost being: He contemplates Himself as though He were another. Thus the Infinite must not only apparently but really pass through the step of Finiteness in order to attain to the consciousness of His own Personality. This development through contradictions is no accident to the system; it enters into the very essence of its God. It is considered to account for the existence of the universe. It is an express dictum of Hegel that the world is as necessary to God as God to the world, for the immense multiplicity of creatures is indispensable to the Spirit, in order to think out His own Infinity. In the same way, finite thoughts are necessary to Him, in order to enable Him to evolve the contents of the Absolute Idea, which is Himself. The individual thinker is thus merged in the Universal Reason. What we take for the activity of our own intellect is God thinking in us. That strange dialogue between subject and object which ever goes on in our own bosoms, and which we call thought, is the Infinite Spirit talking to Himself in finite conceptions. Thus the stage of contradictions is passed and the mind rests in the discovery that its intellect is really that of the Absolute. The name of Pantheism is often recklessly used, yet surely to Hegel, at least, it may be most conscientiously applied.

We have dwelt on this system in order to lay bare the springs of a theory of development which we fear is very widely spread, as well as to exhibit what is the opposite extreme to the tendency of Anglicanism.

It is easy now to see the meaning of the strange terms in which Baur has couched his theory of development. We can understand what appears to be the wild dramatizing of the Idea, and its interchange with Spirit. The objective Being of God compels Him to think out its contents in an inexorable way, and all the history of the Universe is but the self-development of this great Logic. In this process Christianity is but a stage, and each age, even the Apostolic, only one link in the series. Hence the variations in the Fathers, and even the presence of heresy. Verbal differences are not enough. Contradictions are absolutely necessary. If there were no real change, all the parts of the great drama could not be played out.

We need hardly say that, considered simply as a theory of development, the theory is baseless; for that out of which all things are developed must plainly be wider and deeper than all. Even, however, if this were not the case, it must be so, at least, with a revelation given once for all. Of course, Hegel

does not believe Christianity to be a revelation in this or in any real sense. We, however, believe Christianity not only to have been a revelation, but we believe it to be exclusive in the strictest possible sense. It ceased absolutely with the Apostles. They deposited the faith, their successors only transmitted it. All subsequent definitions of faith\* are simply the unravelling of matter given by them. Their state of mind was quite different from that of their successors. Theirs was what we may call inspiration; after them the teachers of the Church had only that special guidance of the Holy Spirit, which was promised them by Christ. The Apostolic teaching, then, was not only the first link in a chain; it was that out of which all future developments came, and in which all were implicitly contained. We cannot exaggerate the importance of this fact, on the subject of which we are treating. It seems to us to follow that the Apostles must have had explicitly in their minds all the future definitions of faith, though not, of course, necessarily in the same terms. They must have so framed their teaching that it was capable of all subsequent developments. If they did so by a conscious intellectual act, must they not have had them before their minds? We can only answer the question in the affirmative. Thus, if the Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady was a part of the original deposit given by Christ to His Apostles, it must have been clearly before the intellect of S. Peter. Furthermore, since there has been no subsequent revelation to the Church, that truth must have been transmitted to their successors at least in such a shape that without any extraordinary supernatural interposition, it can be extracted from the propositions left with them. Besides this, these propositions must have in some way reached the understanding of the teaching body of the Church. In other words, the truth must have been really contained in the explicit teaching of the Apostles, and have been really known by their successors at least implicitly.

All this seems to flow from the very primary notion of Christianity, as a revelation given once for all. Thus stated, there is little difficulty. The real difficulty begins when we come to analyse our conceptions, and reduce them to scientific precision. Development is the process by which what was given implicitly becomes explicit. From what we have already said, it is quite plain that there may be right and wrong theories of development. On the one hand, it must not be

---

\* "All subsequent *definitions of faith*": we are not denying, of course, that the Church often puts forth *other* infallible determinations, for the purpose of *protecting* the Deposit.

a meaningless, monotonous iteration of terms,—a senseless echo repeating what it does not understand; on the other, it must not be a substantial change. The truth must lie between Anglican death and Hegelian convulsions. It is not a spirit to be evoked out of the “vasty deep” of human opinion, without being interrogated as to whence it comes. It is full of questions, which go down to the depths of great mysteries. It is irritating to see shallow writers on development attempting to conjure with a name which they do not understand, and after walking complacently blindfold, beside red-hot questions which they have never perceived, look back and think that they have done a miracle. The miracle would be in walking unhurt over them, not *beside* them. The real question, after all, is one of fact; and, as we have said before, it does not seem to us at all hard to point out the idea in the teaching of the Fathers, which really contains, for instance, the Immaculate Conception. It requires, however, a thorough knowledge of the subject, and a patient industry, which all do not possess. In the meanwhile the speculative difficulties are plain enough, and exist not only with respect to Our Lady, but also to the Holy Trinity.

After all that has been said, we are now in a condition to apprehend what these difficulties really are, and in part to suggest a solution. It has never been sufficiently remarked, that in his book on Development, Father Newman by no means denies that the consubstantiality of the Divine Word was taught explicitly, and in equivalent terms, from the beginning; not only by the Apostles, but by their successors.\* We therefore perfectly agree with Mr. Liddon, as we have already said, that it was taught explicitly from the beginning, though not formally imposed by a General Council till the fourth century. The difficulty really lies in accounting for the fact that such important writers as Origen and S. Dionysius should say what is quite inconsistent with an explicit Apostolic tradition. The answer is not as Mr. Liddon thinks, that their *thoughts* were perfectly in accordance with it; nor, as Baur says, that real contradictions are a part of the essence of Christianity. The truth is, that some peculiar mode of conceiving the idea of the Faith, such as the *ὁμοούσιον*, may be denied by some writers previous to the solemn promulgation of it by the Church. To what extent they really denied it, we shall see presently; but already it is evident that the whole view of the question of development is altered if the fact be that

---

\* *Essay on Development*, p. 11.

the first and second centuries held the *ὁμοούσιον*, while the hesitations and conflicting statements came later on in the third. Then there is no difficulty in accounting for the facts by saying that the hesitations of these later Fathers were scientific; that is, that they arose not from a wrong idea, but from a difficulty of harmonizing one mode of conceiving the Truth with some other portion of it. This is only what we should expect, if the Faith is left to be elaborated and formed by human intellects. The movement of development thus conceived is by no means a direction in a straight line, where each stage is an ever-increasing progress upon the last; on the contrary, it moves in a circle, and ends where it began. Amidst all the wild theories of Hegel thus much is true, that he has rightly described the movement of development, as a progress the second stage of which is one of conflict, harmonized by a return in the third stage to the unity of the first. The question which remains rather concerns the state of mind of the Fathers whose faulty conceptions cause the whole difficulty. Were they heretics? Did they fully acquiesce in even materially wrong views? How can they be said really to have held the Faith? In what way can we express the relation of their view to the truth?

Furthermore, if the right answer be, as we fully believe, that suggested by S. Thomas, that it was known, but known only implicitly to those whose language and whose conceptions were utterly inconsistent with it, then what is the meaning of implicit knowledge? How is it real knowledge? If explicit knowledge means nothing more than the expression in equivalent terms of what was known implicitly, that is, in other terms,—then evidently the whole is a matter of words; and we give up the grand doctrine an easy prey to those who are already too well disposed to look upon it as a squabble about metaphysical terms. If we do this, let us be consistent and take refuge with the Dean of Westminster in the secure haven of picturesque theology. Let us be real, and not use the term development as dust to be thrown in the eyes of a wavering partisan or of a less acute antagonist, making the process meaningless in the case of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, accretive in the case of the Immaculate Conception. The question is to be looked in the face. How can implicit knowledge be looked upon as knowledge at all? And if explicit knowledge is an addition or an advance, what is added, and in what does the progress consist?

Such are some of the speculative difficulties of the case; and we must not be surprised to find that the ground has been to a great extent prepared for us even by the most im-

perfect sketch which we have given of the Hegelian system. The theological requirements which must serve as landmarks to guide us are sufficiently plain; we must keep them steadily in view, and with their help it will not be so hard to thread our way amidst the mazy labyrinth of paths which lie before us. Any theory of development must provide for three conditions. It must presuppose that the whole Faith was left on earth by the Apostles at least in an implicit shape. Secondly, it must provide for some real apprehension of the whole arriving at the minds of their successors: for implicit knowledge is real, and that which is in no way apprehended by the mind cannot be developed. Thirdly, it must show cause why that knowledge is imperfect: in other words, it must point out the need for development, in order to account for the fact; and it must do so in such a way as to save the honour of the Fathers of the first centuries, whom the Church will not consent to consider as heretics.

If these three conditions are fulfilled, then the remaining questions lie very much within the compass of philosophy. It is not wonderful that Germany, which is the very classical land of development, should help us to point out those natural processes which are analogous to, and which justify the theological notion. We will draw this out by contrasting as briefly as possible the theories of the two distinguished Catholic writers, whose names stand at the head of this article,—Father Newman and Professor Kuhn, of Tübingen. It will be seen that both in different degrees have used as a means of accounting for the fact of development, that very theory of the human understanding, which Hegel used to account for what he represents to be the inner dialectical movement of human thought.

We will begin with Father Newman: which we are the more anxious to do, because without some attention his theory might be mistaken for that which we found in Dean Mansel, though we hope to show that this appearance only arises from the imperfect way in which he has sketched his view. We will give it as much as possible in his own words. Unlike other writers who have covered themselves with the ægis of his name, Father Newman starts with doing the fullest justice to the knowledge possessed by the Apostles. “The holy Apostles,” he says, “would know without words all the truths concerning the high doctrines of theology which controversialists after them have piously and charitably reduced to formulæ, and developed through argument” (p. 83). This is allowing far more than a knowledge of what is *de fide*; it assigns to them a view down to the deepest depths of Christian

thought. "After the death of the Apostles the whole of the Christian Faith was left in the shape of written or unwritten traditions; but with this great difference, that these great truths were henceforth received and transmitted by minds not inspired and through media which were human." Again, "The time at length came when its recipients ceased to be inspired; and on these recipients the revealed truths would fall, as in other cases, at first vaguely and generally, and would afterwards be completed by developments." Nor would Father Newman have a difficulty in allowing that Christianity in this respect was on a level with sects and doctrines of the world. "Christianity differs from other religions and philosophies, in what it has in addition to them; not in kind, but in origin; not in its nature, but in its personal characteristics, being informed and quickened by what is more than intellect, by a Divine Spirit" (p. 85). As far, however, as the intellects and minds of the recipients are concerned, no special grounds of exception can be assigned to it. It must develop like other religious systems. It can claim no exemption from the ordinary laws which govern human ideas. It has, indeed, an infallible developing authority, and thus has objective external means of distinguishing between true developments and false; but the subjective process is precisely the same, because the intellect of a Christian and the intellect of a heathen are precisely the same.

Now there is a special reason why all ideas, in this sense purely human, must develop; namely, because all ideas are necessarily judgments, and every judgment is necessarily only a partial aspect of a whole. "Whole objects do not create in the intellect whole ideas, but are, to use a mathematical phrase, thrown into a series, into a number of statements, strengthening, interpreting, correcting each other, and with more or less exactness, approximating, as they accumulate, to a perfect image" (p. 94). A judgment is in its very nature a comparison of parts of an object, a process of analysing and of splitting up. Thus it can only be one view or aspect of a whole. These aspects, taken individually, are indeed not identical with the whole, because they are essentially parts; but they are practically identical with it, as far as we are concerned, because it cannot possibly be viewed except under its aspects (p. 34). The human mind can know nothing whatsoever about an object, except as far as it judges it; and therefore its present judgments, that is, its partial views, are simply the measure of its present knowledge. Hence the absolute need of developments. For Christianity is an idea, or a collection of ideas; and ideas, being judgments, are not



“ordinarily brought home to the mind except through the medium of a variety of aspects, like bodily substances, which are not seen except under the clothing of their properties and influences, and can be walked round and surveyed on opposite sides, and in different perspectives, and in contrary lights.” Thus time is a necessary condition for the apprehension of the whole truth, and this gradual unfolding of its various aspects is what is called its development.

It is curious how, in all systems, this same faculty of human judgment plays its part. Alike in Hegel, Dean Mansel, and Father Newman, the problem to be solved is the relation of our finite judgment to our knowledge of the Infinite. Curiously also, Father Newman’s theory of the necessity of development is founded on premisses which look very like those on which Dean Mansel founds his view of its impossibility. As that writer makes a judgment to be always the unit of thought so Father Newman defines ideas to be “habitual judgments.” It is true that further on there is this difference: Father Newman only asserts the *practical* identity of ideas and judgments, without saying what Dean Mansel says, that they are absolutely the same. He does however at least imply, that to the human mind practically an idea is non-existent except as far as a portion of it reaches it through judgments. All its other portions and the idea as a whole are zero. If the human mind possesses any other faculty, natural or supernatural, by which it can obtain even a rude view of the whole, then the necessity for development is not proven; for the need is based by Father Newman on the assumption that, though the whole idea exists somewhere objectively, it cannot reach the human mind in any sense except partially and by degrees. In his view, immediately after the Apostles the sun of divine truth suffered a partial eclipse; no human eye saw, even dimly, the full disk. Its development is its gradual unveiling. That part which is hidden is to us total darkness. Under these circumstances, development of course is a necessity. The case, however, is by no means so clear, if the full orb is still visible, and only the parts have grown less clear through the decrease of strength in our sight as compared with the Apostles.

This comparison is already enough to show that there is a difference between Father Newman and Dean Mansel. In the view of the latter, the eclipse is total; in that of the Catholic writer, it is partial, though, as far as it goes, absolute. As a whole, the object is hidden, and the parts which are not seen are total darkness. The difference and the likeness between the writers are more forcibly brought out



by Father Newman's view that a doctrine, so far as it is a mystery, "cannot be developed," because, "relatively to us, its statements are mere words" (p. 98). In other terms, he makes a sharp and complete division of a mystery into the incomprehensible and the comprehensible part; the former is to us not twilight, but absolute darkness. Its light never reaches the mind at all, and will never reach our planet, not from its distance, but from inherent impossibility of apprehending it with our faculties. Is this, however, true of any part of revelation? Is not this equivalent to saying that partially, at least, Christianity is inconceivable? That there are hopeless contradictions in it, which make it to us no-sense? Is not the incomprehensible part precisely the supernatural part, and if the residuum is purely human knowledge, we may ask, as in the case of Dean Mansel, what has been revealed?

It would, however, be manifestly unfair to press too far an obiter dictum of an author who was not a Catholic when he penned those words. The real difficulty of the whole thing seems to us to be, that if there were no counter-statement of the author, it would seem to leave no provision for, or rather would exclude the possibility of, any knowledge, even implicit, of the whole Christian faith during the process of development. If the whole idea of Christianity is not contained in minds, which, on the hypothesis, it has never reached, it may fairly be asked, where is it? Where are the undeveloped parts? Are they contained in a set of words? But we know that words are incapable of development. Is the hidden portion contained in the sum of the portions which are known and of the judgments which have been formed? On the contrary, these judgments, as we know, are not equivalent to the whole. Nor again do they contain each other, nor act as an impulse to further knowledge, without some previous knowledge, however dim, of the whole. Surely it must be that the power of forming judgments, that is, of splitting up an idea into parts, implies some previous possession of the whole. It is not the entire account of the formation of our ideas to say that they are simply judgments. A thing to be judged must already, in some sense, be understood; and if it is ever so imperfectly apprehended by the mind, then, even practically, our simple apprehension of it goes beyond our judgment. It must have been placed, so to speak, at the bar of our mind, have been rendered present to it, and at least have been roughly conceived by it, before it can be judged. Some act of presentation must have taken place before we can represent it to ourselves even in thought. Judgment is essentially a reflective act, but

reflection implies a mental object to be reflected on. Judgment is an analysis, and every analysis implies a previous synthesis ; it implies that an object has reached the mind in some sense as a whole, else it could not be split up into its parts. The old dilemma about the relation between judgments and concepts might be quoted here. A judgment is itself composed of at least two concepts, and therefore presupposes them ; but if concepts are simply the produce of the faculty of judging, they in their turn presuppose judgments. Here then we have an infinite series, judgment presupposing concept, and concept presupposing judgment. This therefore is not the entire account of the faculties concerned in the formation of ideas. A rudimental knowledge of the whole performs some practical function in the process. Even in Father Newman's own illustration, the mind has some rough view of the whole material object at least simultaneously with its judgment that it is coloured, round, or smooth. What we judge is the whole object in some sense known.

Still more is this certain in objects of faith. In point of fact, that of which the intellect first catches a view is the doctrine as a whole. What was first known was the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Out of this came various judgments; the notion of the Monas, the Consubstantiality, and the Circuminsession of the Persons. A very real knowledge of the whole was absolutely necessary to act as the impulse to the evolution of the parts. Otherwise they would have lain like geological strata, one upon another, without being fused in the furnace of thought. It was not a mere question of formal logic. All A is B would not have been enough to decide the Arian controversy. The question was, what was the *idea* attached from the first to the word God by all Christians, when they used it of the Son. The sense was the point, not the word. Without the knowledge of the whole Trinity, the Procession of the Holy Ghost could not be evolved out of the Consubstantiality of the Son. One part does not imply the other, and the knowledge of one part is not even implicitly the knowledge of another, without some knowledge of the whole. The parts are the real objective contents of the whole, they do not necessarily contain each other. A dim knowledge of the whole is ever the grand impulse to the irresistible movement of the inner dialectics of the idea, which, through the judgment, forces its contents into the consciousness of the intellect.

For this truth we gladly appeal to Father Newman himself. We wish that we had space to quote the whole passage, for every word tells, and to curtail is to mar its eloquence.

The mind which is habituated to the thought of God, of Christ, of the Holy Ghost, naturally turns with a devout curiosity to the contemplation of the object of its adoration, and begins to form statements concerning it before it knows whither or how far it will be carried. One proposition necessarily leads to another, and a second to a third ; then some limitation is required ; and the combination of these opposites occasion some fresh evolutions of the original idea, which, indeed, can never be said to be entirely exhausted. This process is its development, and results in a series or rather body of dogmatic statements, till what was an impression upon the imagination has become a system or creed in the reason. Now such impressions are obviously individual, and complete above other theological ideas, because they are impressions of objects. As God is One, so the impression which He gives of Himself is one ; it is not a thing of parts, it is not a system, nor is it anything imperfect and needing a counterpart. It is the vision of an object. When we pray, we pray not to an assemblage of notions or to a Creed, but to One Individual Being. This being the case, all our attempts to delineate an impression of Him go to bring out one idea, not two or three, or four ; not a philosophy, but an individual idea in its separate aspects. This may be fitly compared to the impression made on us by the senses. Material objects are real, whole and individual, and the impressions which they make on the mind, by means of the senses, are of a corresponding nature, complex and manifold in their relations and bearings, but, considered in themselves, integral and one.\*

Most true and most nobly said, but at the same time most inconsistent with what had been said before. Here is a whole object creating in the intellect a whole idea, a direct contradiction of a passage which we have elsewhere quoted. Here is an idea which is not a judgment but “ an impression on the imagination.” Previous then to the partial aspects into which the great Object of our faith is split up by the faculty of judgment, we have the power of catching a sight, however obscure, of the whole. The human intellect is not so cribbed, cabined, and confined as Father Newman’s former expressions seemed to imply. It can see beyond its judgments, and they are not even practically identical with its knowledge of an object. There comes upon it an impression of the Infinite and the Absolute previous to and beyond its own fragmentary statements. Surely the faculty by which this is effected is too important to be left out of sight in a theory of development. It seems to furnish us with the very thing of which we are in search, a nucleus out of which all the series of developments is drawn. It is a real knowledge of a whole idea, which implicitly contains all future explicit statements. According to this view, Catholic truth is not a series of views like a diorama,

---

\* University Sermons, p. 331.

which can only be unrolled one after another. It is like a grand landscape spread out before the mind, obscure from its very greatness, and only gradually to be mastered, yet whole from the first.

It is curious to contrast the Oxford theologian with the Professor of Tübingen. What Father Newman calls an impression on the imagination becomes in German hands an idea of the reason; while what he names a metaphysical\* development as opposed to logical, comes before us in Kuhn disguised under the Hegelian term of dialectical.† Although, however, Father Newman has too acute and profound a mind not to have perceived that at least in the case of such a doctrine as the Holy Trinity, the Christian intellect has an impression of the dogma as a whole, yet this most important principle occupies but a small portion of his system of development. He has not analysed it, nor sought to find an analogy for it amongst our natural faculties. He has not shown how this, which he calls an impression on the imagination, is transmitted to the intellect, nor the process by which this one idea is converted into many judgments. He has with his usual sharp-sightedness seen that this process was not one of formal logic; but he has not wrought it into his theory, nor pointed out its functions in the course of the history of doctrine. In this respect his system is far inferior to that of the German professor whose name stands at the head of this article. If the English writer is more original, the German is far more complete. Though the space which is left us is very inadequate, yet we hope that we have so far cleared the way by what has been said, that we shall be able briefly to give a view of Kuhn's system.

There is hardly anything more deeply imbedded in German thought than the distinction between ideas and concepts. Among English writers Whewell has observed the difference. Of Space, Time, and Number, he says that they are "not notions," because they are "not general conceptions, abstracted from particulars," but ideas, that is "intuitions, out

\* Essay on Development, p. 54. v., also 81, 337.

† The following is a German definition of dialectics. "As its instrument for contemplating in thought the self-development of the absolute Reason, philosophy has for its indispensable form the dialectical method, which reproduces in the consciousness of the thinking subject the spontaneous evolution (*Selbst-bewegung*) of the matter thought upon." (*Ueberweg*, iii. 240.) This is singularly like F. Newman's language respecting development, "that it is not an effect of any mechanism of reasoning, but comes of its own innate power of expansion within the mind in its season" (p. 113).

of which entire sciences are unfolded.”\* In Germany the distinction is much better known. Commonly there is even assigned a different faculty for them;† Reason for ideas, Understanding for concepts. A concept is a general notion, the result of many judgments formed from a comparison of a multitude of phenomena, which it binds together into one, according to the laws and categories of the understanding. An idea is an original unity, not formed out of a multiplicity of judgments, but at once a whole, out of which many judgments may be evolved and of which commonly they are an analysis. If this be true, some of our thoughts are not partial judgments, but are a totality and a matrix out of which they issue. Considering the exceeding variety of opinion as to the origin of these ideas, the harmonious assertion of the distinction is very remarkable. Most conflicting are the tests which are given of them, but in all cases the characteristic of the idea is the same, a notion of the mind which is a whole impression, which is cast at one jet, and which, while it is not made up out of a number of previously existing parts, is capable of being expanded into many concepts. Kant’s ideas are God, the universe, and the soul, each of which has a stamp of oneness and totality, not one of which is obtained out of an exercise of the judgment on a number of individuals of the same species. In Hegel the one Idea is the Absolute. The distinction is found in Catholic philosophers, though they differ very much in their account of its origin. It is the foundation of the yet unfinished system of Greith, the Bishop of St. Gall. His list of ideas is the True, the Good, the Beautiful, each an underived notion of the mind, of which experience is at the very utmost the condition, not the cause. According to this author, the first time that the mind comes across an instance of right and wrong, it forms to itself the idea of Goodness, which is an original whole, out of which all subsequent moral judgments are developed; thus then these ideas are the nucleus of which Science, Morality, and Art are the expansion. His expression is, “The Reason takes

---

\* Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, pp. 29, 74, 88.

† Vernunft and Verstand. It is curious that Vernunft is in the schoolmen, intellectus or understanding, Verstand is ratio or reason. We do not forget that in German phraseology there are concepts of the Reason; but we here use concept in its English sense of general notion. Kant’s account of the idea is “a necessary concept of the reason to which no corresponding object can be given by the senses.” Begriff, or concept (of the understanding), is that which joins together in one representation the multifariousness of (empirical) intuitions reproduced (by the imagination).—Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, iii. 175, 180.

up the Idea in its Totality, the Understanding goes into the dissection, the systematising and the clearing up of the Idea.”\* Even in the German portion of the Neo-scholastics, who, while they profess to follow the schoolmen, are not content with a shallow imitation of their language, the same distinction is perceived, though they assign ideas and concepts to the same faculty. Kleutgen† finds the analogue of Kant’s Reason in the mind’s capacity for seeing those first principles which are self-luminous, because they are a light to themselves, while in their light many other truths are seen and concepts formed. What is most remarkable in the theory of cognition advocated by the authors of this school, is their tendency to idealize the notions formed by the intellect of material things. Their general notions have thus much of the characteristics of an idea, that, as soon as the reason is awakened into activity by the presence of an object, without waiting for a multitude of similar objects to serve as a basis of comparison, at once, and by its own laws, it binds into one concept the phenomena presented to it, and grasps the object with a notion already capable of expressing the whole class. Kleutgen‡ here asserts the same truth with respect to material objects, as is enunciated by Father Newman, who says that “the impressions which they make on the mind by means of the senses are real, whole, and individual, complex in their bearings and relations, but considered in themselves integral and one.” In all philosophers worthy of the name, we meet with the same view, that some of our mental operations have this quality, that while they are one, they are pregnant with many thoughts and are capable of development, because they have real contents and a capacity for expansion. All bear witness to the fact, that our conceptions of objects presented to us have more in them than we ourselves at first suppose. Furthermore, in the schoolmen one notion at the very least is a real idea. The part played in their philosophy by the notion of Being shows that they are no strangers to the distinction which we are considering. It is not a judgment yet it underlies all our mental acts. Again, it evolves spontaneously out of itself three other notions, Oneness, Goodness, and Truth, which are called transcendental, because they transcend all the categories of the understanding. They may even be called a synthetical development, for they belong essentially to Being, yet are more than its mere analysis. Above all, there stands out in our mind an idea, which transcends all others, and has characteristics of its own,

---

\* Handbuch der Philosophie, i. p. 68.

† Philosophie der Vorzeit, i. 249.

‡ Philosophie der Vorzeit, i. 570.



the idea of God. We feel that it is capable of infinite expansion, because, though we know that our thought of Him is true, yet we also know that He goes far beyond not only what we say, but what we think. The scholastics express this by saying that God is above all genus, and that even the qualities of Being and Substance, which we assign to Him, are not to be conceived univocally, but analogically. These are all conditions of a true development. The idea is individual and one, yet it has an infinite capacity of being expanded into endlessly multiform thoughts. It is understood yet can never be comprehended. It has a real residuum beyond all the concepts which we can form of it, for Infinite Being is something positive even after all finite imperfection has been thought away. There the highest Mysticism and scientific Theology meet. We are able to see that whatever we think of Him is nothing compared to what He is, yet that that Nothing transcends all finite Being, and has in it a positive power which impels us on to think out what is and must ever be beyond all thought.

Now whatever may be thought of the truth of this view, no one can doubt its importance, or fail to see its bearing on the question before us. Here is a real intellectual whole, out of which judgments are developed, and of which they are parts. Here is an intellectual act, a simple apprehension of an object which is not absolutely identical with the concepts formed of that object, which goes beyond them, and is not exhausted by them. It may be that only so much of it is available for thought and words, as is conveyed in judgments; yet the undeveloped residue is a reality and serves a real purpose; the whole idea steadies and corrects the waverings and aberrations of the judgment. It is the ideal curve which guides the movements of the thought, and to which it must ever return amidst all the wildness of its flight. It is to this view of the distinction between ideas and concepts that Professor Kuhn points to explain many difficulties in the history of Christian doctrine. He uses the analogy of the natural idea of God, and applies it to the revealed; and he thus accounts for the fact that certain Fathers might not be theologically orthodox in their statements of certain doctrines, while their mind was right. In the natural order, the human intellect has a view of God as a concrete, infinite, personal being. This idea is a great whole, in which is included all that can be known of God. Out of this can be developed all the judgments which can be formed of Him. Between the first rough sketch in the mind of an orthodox savage and the *actus purus* of S. Thomas, lie a vast number of judgments—in which it is



quite conceivable that a believer in the one true God might lose his way, and yet be substantially right. The grand Infinitude of an Incomprehensible being is perfectly inexhaustible; and the moment that we begin to be scientific, and to analyse our idea of Him, innumerable apparent contradictions bewilder and dazzle us. Our method of reconciling them may be quite wrong, yet our idea may all the while be right. Not only our words, but our very concepts may be faulty; yet we have something to fall back upon, namely, the original idea of God as a whole, amidst all the partial blindness and confusion of our thought. If this be true, then implicit knowledge becomes a reality. It is no longer a matter of words when we say that implicitly the early Fathers knew all Christian doctrine. They possessed the idea which was implicitly all the concepts of subsequent theology, and out of which all were developed. The analogy of natural ideas can, of course, only be applied with great caution to revelation, yet we are convinced that it is both real and useful. Kuhn has only enunciated, in philosophic terms, the grand statement of S. Augustine; "*Deus veriùs est quàm cogitatur, et veriùs cogitatur quàm dicitur.*" According to our author, this is true both of the natural and revealed knowledge of God. In the natural order, there is an idea of God, not won without the help of creatures, yet ever pushing us beyond them, because it involves a consciousness that He is not only far beyond, but different in kind from all thoughts derived from them. This idea we are constantly struggling to express in thoughts which we know to be inadequate, and in words more inadequate still. Far more is this true in revelation. There is supernaturally impressed upon the mind of the Church an idea of God as Triple in Personality. This idea, while it is so incomprehensible and ineffable, that the human intellect, even supernaturally illumined, can only dimly see a certain way into it, has got to be expressed in human concepts. Hence the struggle called development.

S. Justin, S. Dionysius of Alexandria, and S. Irenæus, all had the same grand object before them. Not only the wants of their intellectual being, but far more, love for their God and Saviour, urges them on with an irresistible impulse to grasp with their thoughts what is far above their understanding.\* With a sort of loving agony their mystical intuition of God will not let them rest till they have realized the Incomprehensible in concepts which they joyfully

---

\* See a fine passage in Kuhn, i. p. 249.

acknowledge to be inadequate, and till they have announced to their fellow-men the Ineffable in words, strong with the strength of enthusiasm, though utterly feeble as compared, not only with the grand Object of their love, but even with their own thoughts. Hence the variations of the first centuries. Theology had to be framed in the midst of the fire of persecution. Not only the captious questions of the heathen, but the inner questionings of the spirit, impelled the understanding to conceive in human concepts the Divine idea impressed upon the soul by the Holy Ghost. Until the Church spoke and declared that not only the right expression, but the right thought was the Son's Consubstantiality with the Father, individuals might vary as to the scientific concept which best conveyed it, while the idea in their minds was really identical.

Here, however, we are met with a difficulty which we have already mentioned, and the solution of which by Kuhn will initiate us further into his view of the connection between ideas and concepts, and of the intellectual process by which the latter are evolved out of the former. According to his view of the facts of development, although from the very first all the Fathers believed that there was but one God, and that the Son was as truly that one God as the Father, yet the Church had never authoritatively imposed the peculiar conception of the Oneness of Substance as the only scientific mode of expressing the truth both in thought and word. Thus it was possible for some ante-Nicene Fathers to take methods which were theologically imperfect for translating into human thought the grand mystery which all believed. In other words, though the Oneness of the Godhead of the Son with that of the Father was always the idea of the whole Church, and consequently, even previous to Nicæa, the Arians were always heretics, yet that particular mode of conceiving the Oneness involved in the *ὁμοούσιον* was not defined before the great council. Here, then, comes the double question: why did the Church not make this definition from the beginning; and what was the state of mind of the Fathers who differed from it before the fourth century? Was their view (materially) false, or was it only imperfect? and what is the distinction in matters of dogma between what is false and what is imperfect?

Hitherto we have simply stated, that in Kuhn's theory the idea differed from the concept; without stating his view as to the origin of the idea. Many who have followed him thus far in his analogy between the natural and revealed idea, will pause before they accompany him further; nor are we by any means disposed to accept his whole view. So con-

vinced, however, are we that truth in such matters can only be attained by the utmost charity to all men who are sincere Catholics, and by an equitable judgment of their views which presupposes accurate knowledge, that we do not hesitate to continue our history of his theory. We have seen that Father Newman accounts for the imperfect statements of some early Fathers by supposing what is undoubtedly true, that the aid given by the Holy Ghost to the Church after the Apostles differed from that which was bestowed on the first founders of Christianity, and that their successors were left to the ordinary processes of the human intellect. This of necessity entails partial judgments of the doctrine delivered, and consequently time in mastering it. To this Kuhn has added the perpetual existence of supernatural ideas in the mind of the Church, in order to give an account of such an apprehension of the doctrine as is presupposed in the judgment. The idea is what is judged and mastered. Now, however Kuhn proceeds to a more minute analysis of the process of judgment, by which the idea is converted into judgments. This process is in language well known to German scholars one of moments, that is, of successive stages, which apparently clash with each other, and each of which is imperfect, yet essentially necessary for the final result which reconciles contradictions. The movement of the inner dialectics by which the mind coins ideas into concepts, is essentially one of three stages, thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis. First comes the rude apprehension of the idea, which is positive ; then comes a negative stage, when the judgment analyses its view, sees contradictions in it, and struggles to harmonize them ; lastly comes the final harmony, which brings back the confusion to its original unity.

The reader will recognize views which recall what we have already said of Hegel ; the principles, however, of the Catholic theologian and the Hegelian philosopher are utterly different. Instead of being the produce of the intellect, the idea of Christianity of course is revealed from on high. All ideas, according to Kuhn, natural and supernatural, have this much in common, that they are immediate, that is, not the produce of deduction. Even the natural idea of God is "given and inborn." There is much that is vague in the author's account of the matter ; and he has been accused, we fear with some justice, of an insufficient apprehension of the distinction between the orders of nature and grace. Nevertheless he has taken pains to correct his statements, so as to attempt to meet the remonstrances of Perrone and the decisions of Roman Congregations. His view in his second edition amounts to little more than that the idea which is native to the human intellect, and gained

immediately without a process of deductive reasoning, is that of a possible Infinite Being; the possibility of whom is converted for us into real existence by an inference from His works in the world.\*

That such an idea must involve at first sight apparent contradictions is plain. If it is to cease to be the mere abstract notion of being, it must have attributes assigned to it, that is, it must pass through the moment or stage of appearing composite. It must appear both One and many. Furthermore, these contradictories do not, as in the case of ordinary formal logic, destroy each other. The dialectics of development follow other laws. The contradiction is passed by and transcended, but never destroyed. It is a real truth to the last that God has many attributes. To the last it cannot be said that this is false; it is relatively true, though theology finally closes the circle by declaring that God is pure actuality. Whatever may be thought of Kuhn's view as to the immediate natural idea of God, there can be no question that revealed truths are immediate in this sense, that they are not gained by reasoning, but accepted immediately on God's testimony. The application to the theology of the Fathers is obvious. Here, in matter still more beyond the reach of intellect, moments or stages in the conception of the object of faith are indispensable; here, too, they may be only relatively false. Thus S. Dionysius of Alexandria, and the Greek Fathers in general, are perfectly aware that the Son is absolutely One God with the Father, and they say so. This is their starting-point. They also know, however, that there must be a difference, and they seek for a scientific concept to harmonize the difference without destroying the unity. This is the moment of antithesis. S. Dionysius attempts to reconcile it by the concept of the origin of the Son from the Father, and uses words which imply time and a sort of spiritual creation. Other Greek Fathers use the representation (*Vorstellung*) of a generic unity between the Father and the Son, of which we find traces very late in the term "three hypostases."

---

\* This view seems to be that of the *Katholik* for 1860, quoted in Schmid's *Wissenschaftliche Richtungen*, p. 185. Kuhn's expressions are as follows: "Even the immediate God-consciousness of our spirit is a purely relative knowledge of God," being "a mediate knowledge of His being drawn from His revelation of Himself in it (our spirit). Thus what the mind is immediately conscious of is not God, but itself in which God is mirrored." Kuhn calls the mind both eye and mirror. Again: "The knowledge of God native to the spirit is only called immediate comparatively; i. e., in comparison with that drawn from creation, because the spirit need not go out of itself to seek it."—(Kuhn, ii. 590.)

That these concepts are quite inadequate and imperfect, without the addition of the *ὁμοούσιον* to define an identity of Substance, is quite plain. Were they, however, even materially false in the mind of the writer? It depends entirely on this, whether the Fathers looked upon them as moments or as the absolute truth. If they said to themselves: this concept of mine, involving time and substantial difference, is the adequate truth, then they were material heretics. If, however, they were perfectly conscious how far their representation fell short of the truth, then it was only imperfect, not false. It is quite true that the Son derives His Godhead from the Father, and that the notion of generic unity goes a certain way to help us to conceive the Trinity, and that all acts even in the Godhead are to be expressed as taking place in time. All this, however, is imperfect; and it becomes false unless the mind goes forward to the further final moment of synthesis, to the identity of Substance which harmonizes, corrects, and crowns the process of development.

We hope that this sketch, however rude, will give some notion of Kuhn's theory of development. We are by no means prepared to accept it all; nevertheless, it seems to us to contain many elements which may be worked up into a true theory, while it completes what appears to us imperfect in Father Newman's book. We trust that a few words will enable us to sum up what we have said, as well as to offer by the way some suggestions towards correcting Kuhn's theory.

1. Though Kuhn is a man of far different principles from Günther, against whom he has expressly written, yet he does not seem to us to assign a sufficient place to the supernatural in his account of doctrinal ideas. Most fully does he teach that Christian dogmata are simply, as he expresses himself, "given" by a purely supernatural act on the part of God, and utterly undiscoverable by reason. Nevertheless he does not seem sufficiently to make the part of grace in the formation of the ideas which are the vehicles of dogma in our minds, an integral portion of his system. It seems to us that the operations of grace and nature are so interwoven in the ideas which bring home the faith to us, that no sharp division can be instituted between them, and consequently it is impossible to argue about such intellectual acts precisely as we should about natural ideas. Certain it is that theologians look on such ideas as really divine. A few, as Ripalda, consider them as wholly supernatural; all, however, look upon them as supernaturalized and elevated, either by the very habit of faith, or by a supernatural light, or, as is gathered from S. Thomas, by an interior supernatural help, strengthening the

intellect.\* Kuhn compares the idea to the red thread running through the web of the faith. Is it not more like the melody which as a living spirit animates the whole composition so that all variations wind themselves around it, while all at length return to it?

2. Again it seems to us that Kuhn has not given sufficient prominence to the fact that since the infusion of dogmatic ideas never takes place except through teaching, whether oral or written, the Church after the Apostles necessarily starts with at least a sufficient number of explicit judgments, to convey the whole deposit, and its implicit conclusions, to the end of time. In other words, we think that the original explicit judgments were more numerous than Kuhn seems to suppose. It does not seem to us a right mode of stating the difficulty which we have proposed, to say that the Alexandrian school did not originally teach the Consubstantiality of the Son. The real phenomenon is that not only they, but other Fathers also, did teach it in equivalent terms, but also taught what was quite inconsistent with it. For instance, Lactantius,† who is one of the most erroneous in language, uses the very word “*una substantia*” of the Father and the Son, and expresses the view contained under the term, that the Son is as much the One Absolute God as the Father. The same is true of Origen, who, in a passage which seems to be genuine, speaks of the Substance of the Holy Trinity as One. The conclusion which we draw from this is that the notion that the one Substance, which is the Godhead, is not only common to but identical in the Father and the Son, was one of the original judgments left with the Church by the Apostles. What was at fault in the Fathers who are blamed was their scientific theology. They did not see the connection between the concept of Consubstantiality and the rest of their belief. They did not perceive it to be the necessary and indispensable concept in which the Christian idea must be conveyed. Two things were defined at Nicæa in the decree which imposed the *ὁμοούσιον*; the term was obligatory, and the notion conveyed by it was declared to be a part of the Faith. This was new to some earlier theologians, and therefore they sometimes asserted it in equivalent terms, and sometimes denied it. To such theologians the *ὁμοούσιον* was “an accretive” truth. Henceforth identity of substance

---

\* Florez, *Theologia Scholastica*, tom. i. p. 201. He quotes S. Thomas, *Summa*, 2, 2, q. 173, art. 2 ad 3, where the Saint, though he is speaking of prophecy, yet seems to lay down a general principle.

† Kuhn, iii., 213, 221.



was the only absolute way of thinking of the Holy Trinity. Nor let any one suppose that this addition to theology was a small one, or had little influence on the Faith. The right mode of scientific thought is inseparable from the right mode of belief. The relative value of the two modes of conceiving the Unity of the Trinity as a generic or a numerical oneness, is all-important. The former may be used as an analogy, helping us to understand the truth; but if a man stops short at it, he becomes a heretic. The identity of Substance is the truth; and the authoritative definition of it as such at Nicæa was an addition to the knowledge of very many Christians, though no addition to what the Apostles had explicitly taught.

3. We cannot consider the description which Kuhn has given of the course of development to have proved the inexorable necessity of a passage through the stages, which he no doubt in general correctly enumerates. One fact, which he has himself pointed out without seeing its bearing, ought to have modified his view. Kuhn\* thus states the facts of the case:—"Not a single ante-Nicene Father taught that the substance of the Son was foreign to that of the Father; but only a few (such as Callistus and Dionysius of Rome) raised themselves up to the concept of Consubstantiality, and held thoroughly to it throughout their teaching." It is strange that he did not see that there was no such fatal necessity to pass through stages of imperfect teaching, since some actually did not pass through them. One Church at least, on his own showing, was raised up above the laws of development, and that was the Church of Rome.

Not in a spirit of captious controversy, but in deep earnestness and charity we recommend this fact to Mr. Liddon's consideration. We know that he loves the Faith; his book, with all its faults, shows a profound enthusiasm for the Person of Jesus. He is, however, unjust to and rebellious against the Roman Church, as though it had taught new doctrine in defining the Immaculate Conception. But so far at least as his case is concerned, the parallel is complete. Some Fathers in the third century not only deny the expression "Consubstantial," but show that they have an inadequate conception of the doctrine by statements perfectly at variance with it. Nevertheless, we believe that it was the Church's doctrine, nay, her explicit doctrine at the beginning, though not from the beginning promulgated as strictly of faith. In like manner S. Thomas denies the Immaculate Conception in



the thirteenth century ; in spite of this we believe that it was taught by the Apostles, and left as a part of the deposit with the Church. Again, the difficulties felt by S. Dionysius in receiving at once the *ὁμοούσιον* as the one truth were scientific; he did not see how it harmonized with the real distinction between the Father and the Son. In like manner, the hesitation of S. Thomas was scientific; he could not understand how the Immaculate Conception could be reconciled with the real redemption of Mary. Lastly, who taught the clear and complete dogma of the Holy Trinity from the beginning? The Church of Rome. Who, while Alexandria wavered and Antioch denied it, unequivocally inculcated it, though he may not have promulgated it throughout the Church? The successor of S. Peter. This is a most pregnant fact; for, be it remembered, facts are dogmatic in matters of Faith. What is, is a guide to what ought to be. Fact and theory go together. Now we find from the first a theory that Apostolical Churches are especially the standards of faith imposed, and Rome more than all others. This is the very least that can be conveyed by the words of S. Irenæus and even of Tertullian. Various Churches have the Catholic tradition; Rome has the whole tradition.\* What can this mean except that Rome is the developing authority in the Church? Such is the theory; now what is the fact? The doctrine of the Holy Trinity was more fully and completely taught at Rome in the third century than anywhere else. Right and fact go together. Rome was meant to be the teacher of the Church, and she did teach the Church. This fact occurs perpetually in ecclesiastical history. A hundred years before Nicæa, Rome had fought and won its battle against what was afterwards Arianism by condemning Hippolytus. It is true of the doctrine defined at Ephesus and Chalcedon, as well as at Nicæa. In every case the result is the same; the doctrine proposed by Rome, however Rome herself may wait, ends by being accepted by the whole Church. Let us compare the two letters extant written by S. Dionysius of Alexandria. In the first letter he uses expressions afterwards distinctly condemned at Nicæa as Arian. In the second he asserts the Consubstantiality of the Son. What had happened in the meanwhile? The Sovereign Pontiff had spoken, and the Patriarch of Alexandria submits. In like manner S. Thomas denies the Immaculate Conception, and a long debate ensues. There is as much discussion as about the

---

\* *Ista quam felix ecclesia cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt. De Præa. Hæret. 36.*

ὁμοούσιον. The Roman Church tolerated for a time the denial of the doctrine concerning Mary, without ever ceasing, as the Bull *Ineffabilis* declares, to defend, vindicate, and assert that doctrine; but its voice became ever stronger and more clear. Pius IX. was enabled, in the Bull *Ineffabilis*, to recount the steps taken by his predecessors, ever to intimate their own view on the doctrine. At length the time came when he could proclaim that to be of faith which all Catholics already believed.

In conclusion, we now sum up, in a few words, the results of our inquiry. The facts to be accounted for are these. In the third century a large and important school of theologians, comprising not only suspicious writers, like S. Hippolytus and Origen, but even S. Dionysius of Alexandria, teaches not Arianism, but something which may be called Tritheism. Does this prove that the doctrine of the Consubstantiality of the Divine Word is not an Apostolic tradition, but an addition to the faith made in the fourth century? Certainly not: first, because this teaching was unknown to earlier times; secondly, because they themselves, except *perhaps* S. Hippolytus, in simpler statements teach the truth; thirdly, because the Roman Church, at least on two occasions, in the condemnation of S. Hippolytus and in the letter of S. Dionysius of Rome, explicitly teaches the ὁμοούσιον. What, however, do the facts prove, and how are they to be accounted for? What theory will take in the double fact of the Apostolic origin of the doctrine of Consubstantiality and of the contrary teaching of such a man as S. Dionysius the Great? The Anglican theory is that the difference between the Pope and the school of Alexandria was merely verbal; a theory contrary to fact, and only to be maintained on Dean Mansel's view that theological terms do not stand for thoughts. The Hegelian theory is, that Christianity, being a collection of ideas, must necessarily involve a process of real change, each step of which is as true as another; consequently that Pope and Patriarch were contradictory and both equally true. The Catholic view is that the whole Faith was delivered once for all to the Apostles, and has never changed, but that its contents have been elucidated through the decrees of the infallible Church. The particular theory which has been advocated by us in order to express this doctrine is that of development, which may be defined to be the evolution of judgments out of ideas wholly conveyed by the teaching of the Apostles. The process of this development we have found to consist of three stages. First, the teaching of the Apostles conveyed to their successors an idea of the Holy Trinity, the legitimate analysis of which is

all that is now held to be *de fide* on the subject. Of course this idea could only be conveyed through some express teaching, a part of which was, as we believe, in equivalent terms, the *ὁμοούσιον*. Secondly, there came a period, which we may call the scientific. In the first stage the doctrine was held unsystematically, or without reflection on its place in the system of theology. As the Unity of God may be held together with the multiplicity of attributes, without reflection on the fact that it is the highest truth, before which multiplicity must disappear,—so the identity of Substance was held without its being perceived that it is the truth, before which the notion of a generic unity must vanish and be acknowledged as an imperfection. In this second stage, some theologians did not perceive the supremacy of this truth, and were in danger of Tritheism, by giving undue weight to the view of a generic unity of hypostases. This was a period of confusion, in which a wrong theology was endangering the faith. Thirdly, came the period of Nicæa, when the Church brought theology into harmony with the original idea, and imposed the *ὁμοούσιον* authoritatively, as the only concept which was absolutely true. It was the old truth with the important scientific advance, that it alone was the concept which adequately expressed the reality, while all others, which had hitherto been used side by side with it, were most imperfect representations, which must either be corrected or excluded by it. It was the old Apostolic doctrine, but it was now the result of a process by which it was ascertained that of the two rival views of unity, the numerical and generic, the former was the truth; the latter, if held alone, was false.

After all, we are so conscious of the difficulties of the subject, that we, in all sincerity, wish the foregoing pages to be considered only as an essay towards a theory for others to complete. Of two facts, however, we are certain. First, it is possible to assert that the Church from the beginning inculcated, if she did not promulgate, the *ὁμοούσιον*; but only possible on the Catholic hypothesis that the teaching of the Church of Rome, the centre of unity, is the true standard of the teaching of the Catholic Church. The only one of the three great original Patriarchal Sees which without a break and without hesitation taught the *ὁμοούσιον*, at least in equivalent terms, was that of Rome. In other words, the whole history of the *ὁμοούσιον* proves that no argument can be drawn against the Apostolicity of a tradition, because in some places it is denied; and that from the very earliest times the only guarantee for orthodoxy was submission to the Holy See. Secondly, as there was from the first an idea of the Holy

Trinity, and of the Sacred Humanity, remaining one, notwithstanding variations of conception and of expression, so there was also from the first impressed on the mind of the Church the idea of Mary. It was seen in the visions of S. Gregory Thaumaturgus. It found expression on the lips of S. Justina when her chastity was in danger. It persuaded S. Irenæus of the salvation of the guilty Eve. It consoled Saints in the wilderness. It had its poet in S. Ephrem; its preacher in many a Saint. It was a power in the Church. It was like nothing else, being the idea of a Virgin and Mother of God. It was one and integral, in spite of variations. It was too real to be turned aside, even by so great a Doctor as S. Thomas Aquinas. Its legitimate development, which it contained from the first, is the Immaculate Conception.

---

### ART. III.—THE JESUITS IN CANADA.

*The Jesuits in North America.* By FRANCIS PARKMAN. Second Edition. Boston.

IT is one of the characteristics of our age, but chiefly of men outside the Church, that, doubting all else, they never doubt themselves. Every one is intimately persuaded that he is able to do everything. And this assurance, which on ordinary occasions is serene and tranquil, becomes vehement and magisterial when such men treat of the mysteries of religion, for which they have a peculiar attraction, but which to them are no mysteries at all. There are thousands in our day—the author whom we are going to notice is probably of the number—who would cheerfully engage to write a “Life of the Creator,” with authentic details, and an appendix containing “Suggestions for the general improvement of all things in Heaven and on Earth,” if the task were proposed to them by an enterprising publisher. Why not? To such men nothing is difficult, nothing impossible. They would teach philosophy to Aristotle, eloquence to Bossuet, and Christian doctrine to S. Francis Xavier. When some one asked Proudhon if he could not have offered some useful hints to the Almighty in designing the universe, he is said to have calmly replied, without astonishing either himself or his interlocutor, “*Cela se pourrait bien.*”

The most notable fact in connection with non-Catholic philosophers is, that they *will* write about religion, though it is

almost the only subject of which they know absolutely nothing. Yet there are many topics, lying within their intellectual sphere, upon which they are really qualified to offer valuable contributions. They might write about the Suez Canal, or the Antiquity of Man, or the Silurian System, or even about that curious financial institution, the *Crédit Foncier* of England. They have indeed a good deal to say about these, and a thousand other subjects, but none of them appear fully to satisfy their literary ambition. They seem possessed by the idea that they *must* teach the world a new view of religion, or forfeit all claim to originality of thought. And so, in discharge of their responsibility, they proceed to teach religion.

Mr. Parkman, whose book about the Jesuit missionaries in North America is before us, impresses us favourably in many respects. He is intelligent, in which he resembles most of his countrymen, and he writes good English, in which he differs from most of them. He is evidently amiable, sincere, and truthful. It need hardly be said that he manifests the candour which, though it be sometimes only the candour of indifference, is the honourable distinction of almost all American writers. He would disdain to be the organ of dull and querulous bigotry. Yet with these various claims to our sympathy and respect, we wish that he had not thought it necessary to write about Catholic missionaries, much as he admires them. He might write excellently on many themes, but not on this. He lacks the primary qualification. A man who begins such a labour by telling you that he does not believe the supernatural, and has little esteem for those who do, is no more able to explain the phenomena of Christianity, of which the apostolic vocation is one of the most impressive, than an astronomer would be competent to construct a theory of the Cosmos who should begin by denying Kepler's *Laws*, and scoffing at Newton's *Principia*. Deride as fables the doctrines of attraction and gravitation, the sphericity of the planets, and all the truths established in our treatises on Conic Sections and Dynamics, and you will occupy about the same position towards astronomy as a man who laughs at vocation, the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the ministry of the angels, and the action of God in His own creation, occupies in relation to Christianity. If Christianity deals only with what is human, it does not proceed from God. Mr. Parkman is like the astronomer who denies even the postulates of his own science, and is therefore in a condition of radical and hopeless incapacity to discuss the subject which he has chosen. But it is time to let him speak for himself.

This American writer, who has carefully studied

authorities, and learned to appreciate them, lauds the unfailing accuracy both of the Jesuit annalists and of their recent continuators. It is this manly truthfulness which distinguishes him from English writers of the same school. "Dr. Taché," he observes, "after a zealous and minute observation of the Huron country, extended through five years, writes to me as follows:—'I can vouch for the scrupulous exactness of our ancient writers.'" (Intro. p. xxviii.) Of the modern historian of the Canadian mission, the Abbé Faillon, he says in like manner:—"It is impossible to commend too highly the diligence, exactness, and extent of his conscientious researches." Having acquitted his own conscience as a sincere and upright critic by this unreserved statement, his Protestant nature resumes its supremacy, and he goes on thus:—"The credulity of the Abbé Faillon is enormous, and he is completely in sympathy with the *supernaturalists* of whom he writes; in other words, he identifies himself with his theme, and is indeed a fragment of the seventeenth century still extant in the nineteenth." This means, as he proceeds to explain, that the Abbé Faillon, who probably thinks it very natural that Christians of one century should resemble those of another, ventures to record, on the testimony of the missionaries themselves, "the visions and miracles" which accompanied their labours. The same reproach might be made against those inspired narratives of the primitive Apostolic missions, abounding also in visions and miracles, bequeathed to us by S. Luke and S. Paul. Whether Mr. Parkman rejects *them* also as "credulous supernaturalists," we can neither affirm nor deny. If he does not, we may congratulate him on the happy inconsistency; if he does, most people will think that he is only moderately qualified to write on Christian themes. M. Ernest Rénan is not more impatient of the supernatural, the very sound of which is intolerable to Mr. Parkman. And this determination to recognize in Christianity only its human elements, because he has detected that its Protestant preachers are manifestly *not* supernatural, and rashly assumes that all others are in the same unfortunate condition, obliges our intelligent author to involve himself in endless contradictions. Thus, at one moment, he speaks of the missionaries with genuine enthusiasm, as "saints and heroes," and elaborately proves, with evident satisfaction to himself, that they were indeed both; and the next, he is equally careful to prove that, although saints and heroes, they were, after all, only splendid lunatics. It is true that in one place he modestly excuses this adverse judgment by observing, "this is the view of a heretic" (p. 159); and in another, that their strange



ardour in administering baptism "is beyond heretic appreciation" (p. 65); and, finally, that "to estimate a virtue involved in conditions so anomalous,"—i.e., accompanied by the supernatural—"demands a judgment more than human" (p. 207). But this modesty was only fugitive and evanescent, since he immediately proceeds, without apparently professing to be "more than human," to pronounce a judgment than which nothing can be more decisive and peremptory. "They were surrounded," he says, "with *illusions*, false lights, and false shadows—breathing an atmosphere of *miracle*—compassed about with *angels and devils*—urged with stimulants most powerful, though *unreal*—their minds *drugged*, as it were, to preternatural excitement," &c., &c. (p. 207).

Mr. Parkman does not appear to have noticed, when he wrote this passage, that his somewhat rhetorical description applies, in every detail, to S. Peter and S. Paul. Or perhaps he did see it, but did not care to enforce the application. It is possible that, even in America, Protestants are not yet quite prepared to jeer at the first preachers of Christianity. Yet it is certain that the "virtue" of the Apostles was "involved" in precisely the same "anomalous conditions" as those which he reprobates in their successors. S. Peter assuredly "breathed an atmosphere of miracle." It was a small thing to him, if we may believe the New Testament, to control the elements and the forces of nature. His very shadow healed the sick, though according to scientific principles it was a very irregular proceeding, and an offence against the laws of cause and effect. As to "visions," they were almost his normal state. He might well be excused also for believing in "angels," since one of them came to take him out of prison at rather a critical moment of his life. It is quite clear that he believed no less firmly in "devils," like the missionaries in Canada and elsewhere, since he was constantly warning Christians to be on their guard against them—a caution by which Mr. Parkman does not seem to have profited. S. Paul, again, was a "supernaturalist," if ever there was one. He also had visions, healed the sick, and raised the dead. He was once, as he relates himself, "caught up to heaven;" and if any one had told him, as perhaps our American author would have done, that he was "surrounded with illusions" because he said so, we would rather have been, for our own part, at the bottom of the deepest well in Damascus or Antioch than in the position of that philosophical objector, standing face to face with S. Paul. The Apostles were meek and humble men, in spite of their superhuman gifts, but it



was not always quite safe to question those gifts, nor to trifle with those who possessed them, as Ananias and others learned to their cost.

Let us return to Mr. Parkman, who has nothing, we are persuaded, in common with Ananias. If we propose to notice briefly the contradictions in his interesting narrative, it is with a grave motive, which we hope will become sufficiently apparent in the course of these observations. The method pursued by our author makes the task an easy one. He enumerates, one by one, the illustrious martyrs of the Canadian missions, and the more celebrated of the religious women by whom their labours were shared; not neglecting even the eminent laymen who, during the same epoch, held civil or military offices in the French colony. After recording, with apparent enthusiasm, their marvellous lives, unmatched in heroism, as he would be the first to admit, except by the career of other missionaries of the same Church, he anticipates the inevitable argument that only a *supernatural* vocation could inspire or sustain such lives, by boldly affirming that it is precisely the supernatural features of their lives which we ought to reject with disdain, and which cast discredit upon their whole history. And this he does, not with the malice of a heretic, but because he knows nothing of the apostolic vocation, nor of the gifts which accompany it. A heathen would have reasoned more justly; even the Mahometans cried aloud that the great S. Francis was "the friend of Allah," when they saw his manner of life. Such a life has no lesson for Protestants. We do not know to what denomination, if any, Mr. Parkman is attached; and it would perhaps be unprofitable to remind him that even the frigid writers of the school of Paley, who would have smiled at the religious enthusiasm of the disciples of Islam, and of whom it has been said that they regarded Christianity only as something which required to be constantly proved, were accustomed to argue, in a purely mathematical spirit, that the supernatural lives of the Apostles amply sufficed to demonstrate the truth of their mission. According to the theory of Mr. Parkman, however, of which we will presently give some additional illustrations, the school of Paley was too romantic and sensational; and the mere fact that the Apostles professed to see visions and to work miracles ought to be deemed fatal to their claims, and therefore, though our author does not say it, to the religion which they taught. His reasoning, if pursued consistently, would deprive the New Testament of all credit, and relegate its divine narratives to the picturesque domain of fable and fancy. Yet his book, of which this is, consciously or otherwise, the logical conclusion,

has been ardently praised by the editors of at least one Anglican journal. They do not, probably, wish to reprove the Apostles as visionaries and enthusiasts, nor to degrade Christianity to a purely human level; but Mr. Parkman helps them to believe that the pre-eminence of Catholic missionaries—which they also have detected with uneasiness and aversion—is not due to supernatural causes, but only to some peculiarity of temper and disposition; and for this they are grateful. When we see such men heartily commend a volume which reduces all sanctity and religious heroism to the category of “illusion,” we gladly persuade ourselves that their gratitude is rather a blunder than a crime. If it were otherwise, we should be forced to believe that, if they love Christianity much, they hate the Church more, and would rather the first should be proved to be human, than the second admitted to be divine.

It is in such terms as the following that our author speaks of the missionaries as a body:—

The Jesuits gained the confidence and good-will of the Huron population. Their patience, their kindness, their intrepidity, their manifest disinterestedness, the blamelessness of their lives, and the tact which, in the utmost fervours of their zeal, never failed them, had won the hearts of the wayward savages, and chiefs of distant villages came to urge that they would make their abode with them” (p. 70).

Again:—

When we see them, in the gloomy February of 1637, and the gloomier months that followed, toiling on foot from one infected town to another (the small-pox was raging everywhere), wading through the sodden snow, under the bare and dripping forests, drenched with incessant rains, till they despaired at length through the storm the clustered dwellings of some barbarous hamlet,—when we see them entering, one after another, these wretched abodes of misery and darkness, and all for one sole end, the baptism of the sick and dying, we may smile at the futility of the object, but we must needs admire the self-sacrificing zeal with which it was pursued (p. 98).

Alluding to the terrible perils which they daily encountered among other tribes, and which conducted so many of them to an appalling martyrdom, he says, “Nowhere is the power of courage, faith, and an unflinching purpose more strikingly displayed than in the record of these missions” (p. 142). Once more:—“The Jesuits had borne all that the human frame seems capable of bearing”—*i. e.*, mutilation, tortures, famine, and the menace of death, in its most frightful forms, at every hour of the day and night—“Did their zeal flag, or their courage fail? A fervour, intense and unquenchable,

urged them on to more distant and more deadly ventures. They burned to do, to suffer, and to die; and now, from out a living martyrdom, they turned their heroic gaze towards an horizon dark with perils yet more appalling, and saw in hope the day when they should bear the cross into the blood-stained dens of the Iroquois" (p. 146). Mr. Bancroft, in his history of the United States, speaks of them with even deeper admiration. We know no American writer who has done otherwise.

This, then, not to multiply citations, is the bright side of the picture. Now for the dark one. The Catholic reader will hardly anticipate that the missionaries who have just been described so eloquently—many of whom were men of noble lineage, who could have enjoyed all the honours which worldly ambition covets; most of whom were men of vigorous and cultivated understandings; and all of whom had received a liberal and refined education—were trained to the labours of missionary life by a "horrible violence to the noblest qualities of manhood" (p. 11). It is Mr. Parkman who says so. He has deeply studied the question, and this is his view of the institute of S. Ignatius. It will surprise those who, like ourselves, are intimately acquainted with many Jesuits, whom we have found wholly unconscious of the oppression they have endured, and displaying, in spite of it, "the noblest qualities of manhood." But Mr. Parkman, who feels for them the compassion which they do not feel for themselves, considers them the victims of "horrible violence." And this is not all. Mr. Parkman's heroes, perhaps owing to their pernicious training, do all their works, in Canada and elsewhere, as the blind and submissive agents of an imperious Church, which "astounds the gazing world with prodigies of contradiction: now breathing charity and love, now dark with the passions of hell; now beaming with celestial truth, now masked in hypocrisy and lies; now a virgin, now a harlot" (p. 84). It is not wonderful that the missionaries of such a singular Church as this, infected by her spells, should display similar contradictions of character; that they should be at one time "saints and heroes," at another, dreamers and lunatics. Why should they be more consistent than the Church which they serve, and which knows how to captivate their souls by so subtle a mastery?

Among the Canadian missionaries, few displayed the gifts of an apostle more abundantly than the martyr Jean de Brébeuf. Mr. Parkman calls him "the Ajax of the Huron mission, its truest hero, and its greatest martyr." He exhausts in his favour the language of eulogy. "Of the same

race as the English earls of Arundel, never had the mailed barons of his line confronted a fate so appalling with so prodigious a constancy" (p. 389). Even the ferocious Iroquois were astounded at his fortitude, under torments of which it is difficult to read the narrative with composure. His whole life was a victory over the flesh, and he had "a courage unconscious of fear, yet redeemed from rashness by a cool and vigorous judgment" (p. 390). He was conspicuous for exquisite common sense, which his sanctity did not obscure; he was a scholar, a gallant gentleman, a fast friend, a gay and cheerful companion; and having been, so to speak, a thousand times a martyr, he was at last slowly tortured to death by the monsters for whose sake he had cheerfully accepted such a life and such an end. Yet it is of Jean de Brébeuf that his American biographer could say—because, like S. Paul, he was familiar with "visions and miracles,"—"extravagant chimeras fed the fire of his zeal;" and that, in the narrative of his superhuman life, "one may throw off trash and nonsense by the cart-load, and find under it all a solid nucleus of saint and hero" (p. 392).

It was De Brébeuf himself, as our author notices, who recounted, in obedience to his superiors, the "innumerable visions" and other supernatural incidents of his career. It follows that, although "saint and hero," he must either have been all his life the victim of puerile delusions, or a deliberate impostor. Either supposition is more injurious to his Master than to himself. Both are inconsistent with common sense, and with the accepted laws of evidence. But if Mr. Parkman, writing upon subjects wholly beyond his comprehension, talks foolishly, it is fair to him to say that at least he is not inspired by the malice of a sectary. He is simply ignorant of the elements of Christianity, and of God's dealings with His saints. Protestants have no more definite idea of such a man as De Brébeuf than the mass of them have of our Lord Himself. They can appreciate, in a dim and confused way, a heroism which, as they perceive, was not displayed by fits and starts, but was the habit of a whole life, and had no conceivable earthly motive; but they are simply irritated by "visions and miracles," because such events take them into a region full of light for the Christian, but to themselves darker than night, and in which they grope their way with lapses and misadventures painful to the humane spectator. They are acquainted only with a form of religion in which they know the supernatural to be impossible, and which resembles the religion of the Apostles as the skeleton of our museums, to which not a sinew nor a muscle any longer adheres, and which

is held together only by wires and bands, resembles the living man, "in godlike form and majesty erect."

If our author detected, with the characteristic penetration of a Protestant, the "illusions" and other infirmities which marred the piety of De Brébeuf, he was not likely to be blind to the defects of his companions. Jogues and Bressani, Chabanel and Lalemant, Daniel and De Noué, and the rest of this marvellous company, were indeed "saints and heroes," but, nevertheless, do not quite realize Mr. Parkman's ideal. Charles Garnier, who had one brother a Capuchin, another a Carmelite, and a third a Jesuit, was of a frail and delicate constitution. Yet "he entered, not only without hesitation, but with eagerness, on a life which would have tried the boldest. . . . His fellow missionaries thought him a saint; . . . all his life was a willing martyrdom" (p. 101). "His companion Bressani says that he would walk thirty or forty miles in the hottest summer day, to baptize some dying Indian, when the country was infested by the enemy." At last the Iroquois slew him. "Thus died Charles Garnier," observes Mr. Parkman, "the favourite child of wealthy and noble parents, nursed in Parisian luxury and ease. His life and his death are his best eulogy. Brébeuf was the lion of the Huron mission, and Garnier was the lamb; but the lamb was as fearless as the lion" (p. 407). Mr. Parkman, contemplating this martyr from the serene heights of Protestant self-sufficiency, regrets that "his sensitive nature, severed from earthly objects, found relief in an ardent adoration of the Virgin Mary." Would that this were all! but "one can discern, amid his admirable virtues, some slight lingerings of mortal vanity." Alas! "he speaks of his great success in baptizing."

Joseph Marie Chaumonot, a martyr only in desire, accepted toils and sufferings before which the vulgar vanity of the greatest military heroes would have quailed; but it was a defect, we are told, of this imperfect Christian to love our Lady, and to believe in miracles. As he was constantly witnessing the latter, his faith in them was not surprising. "A warrior rushed in like a madman, drew his bow, and aimed the arrow at Chaumonot. 'I looked at him fixedly,' writes the Jesuit, 'and commended myself in full confidence to S. Michael. Without doubt, this great archangel saved us, for almost immediately the fury of the warrior was appeased'" (p. 145). These things were happening to him and his companions almost every day, but, saint as he was, his religious views, our author assures us, were very defective. S. Michael—who is constantly defending us, as we learn from the Prophet Daniel, assisted by the archangel Gabriel and other princes of

the heavenly host, against more formidable demons than the Iroquois (Dan. ix., x.)—saved his life, but neglected to teach him a more enlightened religion. “The grossest fungus of superstition,” writes our author, “that ever grew under the shadow of Rome, was not too much for his omnivorous credulity, and miracles and mysteries were his daily food; yet, such as his faith was, he was ready to die for it” (p. 370).

The Prophet Daniel, let us repeat it, for even Mr. Parkman will hardly deny this, believed exactly what Chaumonot believed; but perhaps some Protestants think that *he* also was addicted to the “grossest superstition”? One of them has dared to accuse even the Master of the Prophets of favouring this vice. Calvin laments, *in loco*, that our Blessed Lord did not rebuke what he calls the “superstition” of the woman who came behind Him to touch the hem of His garment. And since Protestants are not afraid to instruct the Church, they are perfectly consistent in undertaking, like Calvin, to teach the Creator. The crime is exactly the same in both cases, because in both man revolts against the Holy Ghost. But Anglicans regards the Church as a purely human institution, composed of many different and opposing confederations, each teaching doctrines contradictory of the others, and naturally do not comprehend that in rebuking the Church they are admonishing the Holy Ghost. This is their excuse. *Nesciunt quid faciunt*.

One of the chapters of Mr. Parkman's book is entitled “Devotees and Nuns.” In this chapter he appreciates, from his own point of view, and with such qualification as he possesses for the task, the holy women who quitted France to aid the Canadian missionaries in their toils. There were Indian women to be instructed, and Indian children to be rescued from a twofold death. Father Le Jeune had said, in a document which reached Europe, “Alas! is there no charitable and virtuous lady who will come to this country to gather up the Blood of Christ, by teaching His word to the little Indian girls?” The invitation was accepted. Neither the rigour of the climate, nor the perils of such a mission, nor the squalid misery which awaited them, could discourage the charity for which such trials were only attractions. Tender and delicate women, who had been the light of many a peaceful home in France, and compared with whom the heroines upon whom Shakespeare lavished all the treasures of his genius were but dross, left all to follow Jesus Christ to this new land. Marie Madeleine de Chauvigny, a young and noble widow, was the foundress of the first convent in Quebec. “Whatever may be thought of the quality of her devotion,”



says our fastidious author, who is evidently "a discerner of spirits," "there can be no reasonable doubt of its sincerity or its ardour." But it is this gentleman's fate, in the execution of a task for which he did not suspect his own unfitness, to contradict himself at every page. "One can hardly fail to see in her," he says, "the signs of that restless longing for *éclat* which with some women is a ruling passion" (p. 173). When a Protestant contemplates an act of Christian heroism for which he has no taste, he straightway attributes it to a bad motive. By the help of this interpretation every difficulty disappears, and he contrives to pull down the supernatural to his own level. Yet it might have occurred to his critical mind that if this lady had a vulgar passion for *éclat*, the first Canadian winter, and the scenes to which it introduced her, would have effectually extinguished it. The ship which conveyed her from Dieppe bore such a company of Christian women as the Virgin Mother might have acknowledged for her children. Marie Guyard, afterwards the venerable Marie de l'Incarnation, was of the number. Mr. Parkman would have done well to distrust himself for once, and either not to speak at all of such as her, or only with extremest caution. Mystically espoused to her Lord, after a vision which she has recounted herself, she uses in her journal such expressions as we find in the inspired *Canticle*, and in the lives of many saints of the same order as herself. Of such passages our American Protestant says (we omit worse things, which a Christian reader could not endure), "What is most astonishing is, that a man of sense like Charlevoix, in his *Life of Marie de l'Incarnation*, should extract them in full, as matter of edification and evidence of saintship" (p. 177). What is much more astonishing is, that Mr. Parkman, who is rational on every topic which does not pertain to religion, should fail to reflect that, even on purely intellectual grounds, Charlevoix was at least as capable of judging such a woman as himself. But every Protestant naïvely supposes that he possesses faculties granted to no other human being.

The newly-arrived nuns, so celebrated in later times as "the Ursulines of Quebec," "were lodged at first in a small wooden tenement under the rock of Quebec, at the brink of the river." We are quoting Mr. Parkman again:—

Here they were soon beset with such a host of children that the floor of their wretched tenement was covered with beds, and their toil had no respite. Then came the small-pox, carrying death and terror among the neighbouring Indians. These thronged to Quebec in misery and desperation. The labours of the Ursulines were prodigious. In the infected air of their miserable hovels, where sick and dying savages covered the floor, and were

packed one above another in berths,—amid all that is most distressing and most revolting, with little food and less sleep, these women passed the rough beginning of their new life. Several of them fell ill" (p. 184).

Perhaps this was the *éclat* which these ladies had gone so far to seek?

"How did these women bear themselves," continues our author, "amid toils so arduous?" He proceeds to answer his own question, and is especially moved by the gladness and mirth which reigned among them, though he probably did not know it to be the invariable attendant on true holiness. There might be gloom all around them, but there was none in their own hearts. "A pleasant record has come down to us," he says, "of one of them, that fair and delicate girl, Marie de S. Bernard. . . . Another Ursuline, writing at a period when the severity of their labours was somewhat relaxed, says, 'Her disposition is charming. In our times of recreation she often makes us cry with laughing: it would be hard to be melancholy when she is near.' " And then follows a passage, grotesquely contradictory and blandly presumptuous, which is perhaps the most characteristic in the whole book.

One figure stands nobly conspicuous in this devoted sisterhood. Marie de l'Incarnation, no longer lost in the vagaries of an insane mysticism, but engaged in the duties of Christian charity and the responsibilities of an arduous post, displays an ability, a fortitude, and an earnestness which command respect and admiration. Her mental intoxication had ceased, or recurred only at intervals; and false excitements no longer sustained her. . . . Marie de l'Incarnation neither failed in judgment nor slackened in effort. She carried on a vast correspondence, embracing every one in France who could aid her infant community with money or influence; she harmonized and regulated it with excellent skill; and, in the midst of relentless austerities, she was loved as a mother by her pupils and dependants. Catholic writers extol her as a saint. Protestants may see in her a Christian heroine, admirable, with all her follies and her faults" (p. 186).\*

Marguerite Bourgeoys was at Montreal what Marie de l'Incarnation was at Quebec. "Her portrait has come down to us," says our author, "and her face is a mirror of frankness, loyalty, and womanly tenderness." And then he proceeds to daub with rude hand the fair face which had won his admiration. "She had known no miracles, ecstasies, or trances." But she was destined to lose this singular merit, for "after-

---

\* He observes in a note, but only for the diversion of his readers, that when mother Anne de S. Claire saw her for the first time, she wrote to a friend, "I perceived in the air a certain odour of sanctity, which gave me the sensation of an agreeable perfume."

wards, when her religious susceptibilities had reached a fuller development, a few such are recorded of her; yet even the Abbé Faillon, with the best intentions, can credit her with but a meagre allowance of these celestial favours." It was the only blot in her history.

In 1653, renouncing an inheritance, and giving all she had to the poor, she embarked for the savage scene of her labours. To this day, in crowded schoolrooms of Montreal and Quebec, fit monuments of her unobtrusive virtue, her successors instruct the children of the poor, and embalm the pleasant memory of Marguerite Bourgeoys" (p. 202).

The seventeenth century, which in England saw the almost total extinction of religious faith and practice, till a fierce outburst of fanaticism, crying shame on the torpid national Church, filled the land with a hundred new sects, produced in every Catholic region saints and heroes. The laymen who represented France in Canada were not unworthy to witness the virtues of the Ursulines and the Jesuits. Mr. Parkman is almost as curiously infelicitous and contradictory in appreciating the one as the other; but as the laymen were for the most part innocent of "visions and miracles," he finds less in them to disapprove. "Paul de Chomedry, Sieur de Maisonneuve, was a devout and valiant gentleman, who in long service among the heretics of Holland had kept his faith intact, and had held himself resolutely aloof from the licence that surrounded him. He loved his profession of arms, and wished to consecrate his sword to the Church. Past all comparison, he is the manliest figure that appears in this group of zealots. . . . His father opposed his purpose, but he met him with a text of S. Mark: 'There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father for My sake, but he shall receive an hundredfold.' " When Maisonneuve was urged to abandon the perilous post at Montreal, and take refuge at Quebec, he answered, "It is my duty and my honour to found a colony at Montreal, and I would go if every tree were an Iroquois" (p. 203). Even Mr. Parkman is constrained to exclaim, "The spirit of Godfrey de Bouillon lived again in Chomedry de Maisonneuve, as in Marguerite Bourgeoys was realized that fair ideal of Christian womanhood, a flower of earth expanding in the rays of heaven." "Quebec and Montreal," adds our author, "are happy in their founders. Samuel de Champlain and Chomedry de Maisonneuve are among the names that shine with a fair and honest lustre on the infancy of nations" (p. 275). And these men, with all their companions, were, as far as laymen could be, apostles. "From Maisonneuve, as brave a knight of the cross as ever

fought in Palestine for the Sepulchre of Christ, to the humblest labourer, these zealous colonists were bent on the work of conversion" (pp. 267-272). At the very moment when Protestantism was everywhere undermining faith, substituting the material for the spiritual, and converting men into mere intellectual machines, the children of the Church were displaying in all lands the same supernatural virtues, and accomplishing the same works, by which, in earlier ages, the Europe of our barbarous ancestors had been won to religion and civilization.

The American historian whom we have been quoting, and upon whose volume we have still a few observations to make, is himself, in spite of many excellent qualities, an unconscious illustration of the contrast referred to. He can admire what he believes to be *natural* in the heroes whom he describes; he has only scorn for all that seems to be *supernatural*. When Champlain died, and, in the words of our author, "his heroic spirit bade farewell to the rugged cliff where he had toiled so long to lay the corner-stone of a Christian empire," there was a moment of anxiety for the missionaries. "Would his successor be found equally zealous for the faith, and friendly to the mission?" The doubt was soon removed. In June of the following year, Charles de Montmagny, a knight of Malta, followed by a gallant train of officers and gentlemen, landed at Quebec. The Jesuits, still solicitous about the character of the new-comers, met them on the shore. "As they all climbed the rock together, Montmagny saw a crucifix planted by the path. *He instantly fell on his knees before it*; and nobles, soldiers, sailors, and priests imitated his example." Our author cannot resist this unexpected provocation. "The Jesuits," he says, satirically, "were comforted. Champlain himself had not displayed a zeal so edifying" (p. 150). If this crucifix had been a bag of gold, a statue of Washington, or even a model of Bunker's Hill, every one perceives that an attitude of veneration would have been appropriate. But a feeble representation of the Crucified, and a Christian warrior kneeling before it! *Risum teneatis amici?* Do you hear our American friend laughing?

With a few words on the historical results of the mission inaugurated by so many martyrs, and adorned by so many saints, we shall have completed all that we have to say on the book before us. "The primitive Indian," says Mr. Parkman, "yielding his untutored homage to One all-pervading and omnipotent Spirit, is a dream of poets, rhetoricians, and sentimentalists. No race, perhaps, ever offered greater difficulties to those labouring for its improvement" (Introd.

p. lxxxix.) Yet the missionaries converted almost the whole Huron nation, not to speak now of other northern tribes. If only a feeble remnant survive to this day, this is chiefly because the powerful Iroquois, stimulated by the English to destroy the Christian Indians in alliance with France, never laid aside the axe and the tomahawk till the work was accomplished. English and Dutch Protestants in North America, as in so many other regions, have been the most formidable obstacles to the evangelization of the heathen, and have ruined, again and again, flourishing missions, established by the blood and sweat of martyrs, whom they have often helped the savage to slay! They would, no doubt, as Charlevoix observes, have subdued the Iroquois by apostolic arts, but they could not hope to subdue their employers. "The cause of the failure of the Jesuits," says Mr. Parkman, "is obvious. The guns and tomahawks of the Iroquois were the ruin of their hopes" (p. 447). And the guns were supplied by the English. What the missionaries would have done for the natives of North America, if France had maintained her domination, may be judged by such facts as the following, which we owe to the truthful candour of our author:—

When the Christian Indians had, on a certain occasion, vanquished the Iroquois, though a woman of the victorious tribe could say, "they have killed, burned, and eaten my father, my husband, and my children," they showed a self-control which our own troops failed to show, under less provocation, towards the rebel Sepoys of Hindostan. "To the credit of their Jesuit teachers, they treated their prisoners with a forbearance *hitherto without example.*" The missionary, Mr. Parkman adds, had "given them a lecture on the duty of forgiveness" (p. 281).

Again. When the Huron nation was finally overpowered by the Iroquois, a certain number of the former "migrated in a body to the Seneca country," where they were allowed by their enemies, whom they could no longer resist, "to form a town by themselves." They identified themselves with the Iroquois in all but religion, "holding so fast to their faith that, *eighteen years after*, a Jesuit missionary found that many of them were still good Catholics" (p. 424).

Finally, Mr. Parkman sums up in these words what he calls "the influence of the missions." He is speaking of Father Gabriel Druillete's converts, on the northern boundary of Maine:—

They built their bark chapel at every camp, and no festival of the Church passed unobserved. On Good Friday they laid their best robe of beaver-skin on the snow, placed on it a crucifix, and knelt around it in prayer.

What was their prayer? It was a petition for the forgiveness and conversion of their enemies, the Iroquois. Those who know the intensity and tenacity of an Indian's hatred will see in this something more than a change from one superstition to another. An idea has been presented to the mind of the savage, to which he had previously been an utter stranger. This is the most remarkable record of success in the whole body of the Jesuit *Relations*; but it is very far from being the only evidence that, in teaching the dogmas and observances of the Roman Church, the missionaries taught also the morals of Christianity. When we look for the results of these missions, we soon become aware that the influence of the French and the Jesuits *extended far beyond the circle of converts*. It eventually modified and softened the manners of many unconverted tribes. In the wars of the next century we do not often find those examples of diabolic atrocity with which the earlier annals are crowded. The savage was a savage still, but not so often a devil. . . . Thus Philip's war in New Zealand, cruel as it was, was less ferocious than it would have been. . . . Yet it was to French priests and colonists that the change is chiefly to be ascribed (pp. 319, 20).

By these candid and generous words, honourable to himself and to his nation, Mr. Parkman has earned a title which, we may be sure, will be recognized, to the prayers of the Canadian martyrs, and of all who love their memory. If we have pointed out his contradictions, and lamented his rash judgments, it has not been our purpose to give offence to an upright and intelligent man, whose fault is that he has spoken of subjects too high for him, and has spoken unwisely. We see in his book only a new proof, and this has been our motive for referring to it, that Protestantism, wherever its deadly influence is unchecked by lingering Catholic tradition, or indirect piety, is simply anti-Christian. Considered apart from such of its professors as have, in various measures, renounced its principles and repudiated its maxims, Protestantism has proved to be the most powerful dissolvent of Christianity which a diabolical chemistry ever compounded for the use of its adepts. The arguments which it has taught men to employ against the Church are as fatal to the character of the Apostles as to that of their living representatives. If miracles are a delusion and visions a dream; if the most awful sanctity is only a kind of madness; if men and women, who seemed most intimately united to God, and whose virtues and labours have regenerated whole kingdoms, were, after all, but the victims of "preternatural excitement," and the dupes of "an insane mysticism,"—the New Testament is only a record of kindred illusions and infirmities, and they who were supposed to have written it by the inspiration of God were either hypocrites and impostors, or sentimental visionaries and unprofitable



dreamers; for their language is the language of modern Catholic saints, and their lives have never been more exactly imitated than by modern Catholic martyrs. It is evident that the same spirit lived in both. If De Brébeuf and Marie de l'Incarnation were only mystical dreamers, S. Paul, whom Festus supposed to be insane, was no better.

Mr. Parkman's error has been to judge men and actions wholly beyond the comprehension of an ordinary Protestant, for whom the material alone has any value, and the natural any meaning. The spiritual and the supernatural belong to a sphere from which he is self-excluded. If he had wished to make a safe and prudent use of his talents and industry, he should have made himself the biographer, not of Catholic, but of Protestant missionaries. He would at least have understood the latter; and if we judge him rightly, his unflinching candour and his sympathy with all that is heroic, he would probably have given just such an account of them as we have lately read in the work of an English Protestant, who has watched their operations in many lands. "No men that I know of," says this gentleman, who never gets out of his depth by talking of the supernatural, "take better care of themselves than missionaries—I mean those of our own Church; for the Roman Catholic propagandists go where duty calls them, without making any fuss about dangers and privations to which they are about to be exposed. All honour to them for it! But *our* clergy most do congregate where skies are bright and natives tractable, and their cry is always the same—'Money! Money!! Money!!! We cannot save another soul without money.' " \*

---

#### ART. IV.—PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION.

*Essay on Education.* (Irish Annual Miscellany, Vol. II.) By Rev. PATRICK MURRAY, D.D. Dublin: Bellew.

*What does it profit a Man?* By the SON OF A CATHOLIC COUNTRY SQUIRE. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

THE "Month" of last October makes a statement, which we believe to be substantially true. "If . . . the universality of a particular topic of conversation," it says, "amongst our higher and middle classes is a true index of the feeling of

---

\* "Recollections of a Life of Adventure." By William Stamer. Vol. ii. c. 7, p. 147. 1866.

Catholics, there can be little doubt that the great want which makes itself more and more urgently felt among us, is a liberal education analogous to that given at Oxford and Cambridge." But though Catholics are agreed on the great desirableness of a certain end, we hardly remember an instance on which so much difference of opinion has existed as to the appropriate means. In fact, no fewer than six different plans have from time to time been proposed. Firstly, the frequentation by Catholics of existing colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. Secondly, the foundation of a Catholic College at Oxford. Thirdly, an agitation for the admission of non-resident candidates to Oxford and Cambridge degree examinations. Fourthly, a frequentation by Catholics of the Irish Catholic University. Fifthly, a college in England for higher Catholic education. Sixthly, an English Catholic University.

Of these various plans, the two last-named (as we have more than once argued) appear to us in every respect preferable; while the two first are now, thank God, entirely out of the question. But at all events, so long as the existing divergence continues in regard to the appropriate *means*, no combined effort can be put forth for attaining the desired *end*; and it is very important therefore that such divergence should, if possible, be reduced. It has occurred to us that there will be greater hope of this result, if the question of principles be kept distinct in argument from that of application. In our present short article therefore, we purpose to consider exclusively the *principles* of Catholic higher education. This may possibly lead to discussion; and this again may result in the correction or enlargement of our views on this or that particular. In such a manner by degrees thoughtful Catholics, or the large majority of such, may arrive at such general agreement on the matter, as shall greatly facilitate the path of ecclesiastical superiors. For whenever there comes to be general agreement on principles, we do not think any great discrepancy of opinion will arise on the best method of applying them.

We have named at the head of our article two very different works, written by two very different writers; which agree however in this, that they treat with signal ability the question of principle. Dr. Murray's Essay was published not less than seventeen years ago, on occasion of the then projected "Queen's Colleges" in Ireland; and it is interesting to see how many of his remarks are precisely applicable to the present crisis of Catholic England. "The Son of a Catholic Country Squire" wrote at a much later period, in reference to the "Castlerosse

Memorial" of ignominious renown. His pamphlet performed very effective service in its day; and we hope some of the passages we shall select may again on the present occasion do execution. We shall not however follow either of our authors in the plan of our article, because our immediate purpose is by no means the same as theirs.

Higher education, we need hardly say, is for the comparatively leisured classes; for those who can carry on their education to the age of twenty-one or twenty-two, and not only to that of eighteen or nineteen. At present no system whatever of higher education is offered to English lay Catholics; and the want of such an education is more and more urgently felt by them. For want of it, they are both at a moral and intellectual disadvantage; they are almost obliged to employ, in comparatively useless occupations and amusements, those very years, which are immeasurably the most precious for purposes of intellectual training.

When boys have grown into men, we have no universities to send them to. We have schools and colleges; and though they are deficient in many points, we can content ourselves with them. But at that very period at which the mind is most capable of receiving impressions and at which the character is fashioned and stamped for life,—when the energies and powers of the intelligence are most keen and are open to the greatest peril,—and we look around for a place to send our boy to be educated in the real sense of the word, and formed into a man,—nothing but blankness presents itself to us.

Universities of our own we have none. Is he to remain at home, eating the bread of idleness, and exposing himself to the awful dangers of doing nothing? (Pamphlet, p. 27.)

We need not however enlarge on the great need which exists for Catholic higher education, because such need is now unanimously admitted by all. Let us rather proceed to consider of what character this higher education should be, and in what particulars it should consist.

Firstly it must of course be such, as shall correspond with the earlier education which has been imparted, and conjointly with that education shall give due and effective cultivation to the various mental faculties. Many questions have lately been started in England, on the appropriateness of respective instruments for this purpose: on the comparative value, e.g., of classics and physics; of ancient and modern languages; of philosophy, philology, history. We shall not here enter in detail on these questions, though they are undoubtedly of great practical importance. We shall not enter on them in detail, because none of them are questions raised between Catholics and Protestants as such, or between Catholics

of different schools as such. We will but briefly and generally express the views to which we incline, and to which indeed we think that English public opinion is on the whole rapidly converging.

We hold then, that no better intellectual foundation can be laid than in classics and mathematics ; though we also hold that in various ways—such as by the excision of very much superfluous verse making—a solid classical education can be given, with very far greater economy of time than has hitherto been the case. As to physics, we think that all should be instructed in the general principles by which physical truth is discovered and authenticated, and that well-chosen illustrations should be given of these principles ; but we greatly doubt the effectiveness of physical studies, pursued in *detail*, towards first-rate intellectual training. We think that study of modern languages, such as German no less than French and Italian, may be made of great value in the way even of intellectual culture ; while for practical purposes, they may in these days be almost counted as a necessity. We hold, as we suppose every one holds, that historical facts in great abundance should be from the first mastered and chronologically arranged in the mind ; and that on these, as the faculties expand, a wide and scientific study of history should be based. Nor lastly, of course, is any higher education worthy the name, which does not contain philosophical discipline as a very prominent portion of itself.

At the same time, for reasons which we shall give before we conclude our article, it seems to us of less importance that the intellectual discipline of Catholics be in itself the very best attainable, than that it should be altogether similar in character to that prevalent among their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen of the period.

But now secondly—and this is the point on which, for present purposes, we lay by far our greatest stress—it is the business of education, not merely to impart mental cultivation and *power*, but far more emphatically to impart speculative and practical *truth*. A great deal might be said on this subject, in the way of general principle and argument. We venture e.g. to consider it a most serious defect in a work, otherwise so unusually powerful as F. Newman's volume on "the scope and nature of University Education," that the author lays so little stress on this particular function of universities. But on the present occasion it will be perhaps more useful, if, instead of treating this grave question comprehensively and in the abstract, we look at the matter with a direct and immediate view to practical results.

By giving Catholic youths a higher education, you give them ipso facto a far keener interest than they would otherwise have, in philosophy, history, literature. But here in England, philosophy, history, literature are saturated with principles the most violently and fundamentally anti-Catholic. Unless therefore you have provided them with a special antidote against those principles, not only your education will have conferred on them no benefit, it will have done them unspeakable injury. Take these two cases. On the one hand, a clever youth remains pure in morals and heartily loyal to the Church; but after the age of eighteen or nineteen he devotes himself to such occupations as these; he talks and acts on party politics; frequents county society; reads in a superficial way reviews, magazines, and newspapers; amuses himself with hunting, shooting, yachting, cricketing; while he gives at the same time to his priest both money and full moral support. Well, at all events he is leading a life considerable less frivolous than "seventy per cent. of those who take degrees at Oxford": for these, according to the Rector of Lincoln College in that University, are either "the foppish exquisites of the drawing-room," or "the barbarous athletes of the arena." (See our last number, p. 412.) However you make it your boast that you rescue him from this comparatively torpid life; you make him free of the intellectual guild; you inoculate him with a keener taste for philosophy, history, and literature; and then—you leave him without any carefully devised intellectual defence against those godless principles, which he will thus imbibe with unintermitting draughts. "Pol me occidistis amici, Non servastis, ait." Of youths so exposed, we have no doubt at all that some would actually apostatise. The remainder would grow up a noxious school of disloyal, minimising, anti-Roman Catholics: Catholic in profession, but anti-Catholic in spirit: Catholics, who combine the naked dogmata of the Church with the principles of her bitterest enemies, and place the priceless gem of the Faith in a setting of every basest metal: a constant cause of anxiety to ecclesiastical authorities: a canker eating into the Catholic body: a standing nuisance and obstruction.

Indeed even as things are now, many well-intentioned children of the Church, who are very far from meriting the severe epithets which we have just recited, yet find serious difficulty in submitting their intellect to the Holy Father's doctrinal instructions. Whence does this difficulty arise? From this circumstance, that those instructions imply throughout certain momentous, consistent, long-established principles, which Catholics have unconsciously learned (from the godless

spirit of English literature and science) to eschew and contradict. It is no very unreasonable requirement, to demand that Catholic higher education shall bring its recipients into harmony with the Church's doctrinal teaching.

Although then Catholics confined themselves to defensive purposes, it would still be absolutely essential, that their higher education should include a most careful inculcation of religious truth, within the spheres of philosophy, history, and the like. But they will surely not be so pusillanimous as to be contented with self-defence. They must assume the aggressive ; and aim not merely at holding their own, but at enlarging the Church's borders. In one word, they must embark seriously on the enterprise of convincing the non-Catholic intellect. But in these days, as has been so often observed, the Church's more intellectual enemies care very little about theology. Controversy can only be carried on against them by enforcing Catholic views on philosophy and history ; and unless any so-called higher education prepares the rising generation to learn this task, it is but a mockery and a sham. Our educated youths must be animated by a holy anger against the prevalent unbelieving literature and philosophy, similar to that martial zeal which inspired the crusader of the past, which inspires the Zouave of the present.

Some will reply perhaps, that it is only a small number of men, from among the recipients of higher education, who will ever be fitted for influencing the world. Were this so, our argument would not be affected : it would still remain true, that those particular studies which are requisite for *all* to save them from perversion, are also most useful to *some* as preparing them to carry deadly intellectual war into the enemy's camp. But the fact is not as the objection supposes. Consider the anti-Catholic ranks themselves. Their intellectual strength by no means consists exclusively in those few very able men, who hold irreligious tenets with full intelligence. On the contrary, it consists to an even greater extent in a large number of half-instructed or second-rate persons ;—persons who hold the tenets in question with full and undoubting confidence, partly from being surrounded by similar thinkers, and partly from the great intellectual respect which they feel for the leaders of their respective schools. It is the union of these second-rate with first-rate men, which makes up that vigorous and self-confident anti-Catholic opinion, so widely spread throughout England, and so grievously injurious to the Church and the Gospel. In like manner then on the opposite side, a number of educated men, who when young have been carefully trained in Catholic intellectual habits, could make a formidable aggres-



sion on infidelity: they could make such aggression, we repeat, not merely as represented by a few able thinkers, but as, *together* with those thinkers, constituting a compact and united body, filled with confidence in the truth of its convictions. And such body would have this omen of success peculiar to itself, that those convictions, and no others inconsistent with them, are alone in accordance with reason and with facts. To train this body is among the most indispensable ends of Catholic higher education.

It is always useful to descend from generalities to some particular instance. We will take therefore, as an illustration, what is certainly among the most momentous and perverse of all points at issue between the Catholic and infidel schools: we mean the standard of human virtuousness. The Catholic's ideal is most distinct and unmistakeable—saintliness. As we urged in our last number (p. 502) those men, in the Catholic's judgment, are of all the most virtuous, who are most given to the thought of God; to prayer; to mortification of intellect; to mortification of will; to self-examination: those who have the deepest sense of their own nothingness and sinfulness. It is a far more difficult matter—we believe it is an impossible one—to draw out with any precision the standard of virtuousness opposed to this by non-Catholics: they are far more consistent, harmonious, and intelligible, in expressing their contempt or hatred of saintliness, than in explaining their own positive moral theory. But we may say generally, that they regard courage, "high spirit," "sense of honour," zeal for political liberty, zeal for one's country's aggrandizement,\* love of science, and the like, as indefinitely

---

\* We have often pointed out, that worldly and indifferentist self-styled patriots do not in general care much for their country's welfare, even its temporal welfare; but rather for its glory and aggrandisement. But we were hardly prepared for so perspicuous an exposition of the devil's creed, as is presented in the "Pall Mall Gazette" for October 10th, 1868. It runs thus; but the italics are ours:—

"Whatever may be said by particular sections of the community, we still regard patriotism as a virtue. *The lasting glory and greatness* of the English nation and the British Empire is about *the highest object* at which, as it appears to us, English politicians can aim. Cases may be imagined in which the general *interests* and sympathies of Europe would be in favour of the enemies of England; but it would not be the less true in that case that an Englishman who *took that view* and acted upon it would be *an infamous traitor.*"

We are very far from meaning to imply, that all those who are unhappily more or less enmeshed in the snare of spurious and worldly patriotism, go the whole of this detestable length; but it is worth while to see what an English newspaper, universally accounted respectable, has ventured to state. The highest aim then of a politician, it seems, is not at all his country's

higher virtues than humility, purity, forgivingness, mortification of intellect, mortification of will, contrition, self-abjection : if indeed they condescendingly admit these latter to be virtues at all.

Now it is plain, as soon as stated, that no intellectual question can possibly be more fundamental, than this one on the true standard of virtuousness : it pervades the whole body of history and literature ; it pervades every study of every kind, which is concerned with human acts, energies, aspirations, and emotions. If there is one part of Catholic higher education more indispensable than another, it must surely be, that students are trained habitually and practically to estimate human conduct according to the Church's measure ; that they are carefully guarded against estimating it according to those maxims—at once so detestable morally and so contemptible intellectually—which prevail in the godless society of modern Europe. Nor again is there any portion of the Church's present intellectual warfare more vitally momentous, than her efforts to overthrow the world's standard of morality and substitute her own. The alternative then which we are now to consider, is simply this : whether a few chosen men will sufficiently help her in her protests against the prevalent moral standard, or whether she needs the co-operation of all educated Catholics in her labour. Surely the

---

moral and religious welfare ; the diminution of crime, the increase of contented industry, increased purity of morals : nor even is it the advancement of temporal welfare ; the increase of innocent enjoyment, the diminution of squalid poverty, the accessibleness of medical aid for illness and of legal redress for injuries. All these, it seems, should be aims entirely subordinate to that paramount one of "lasting glory and greatness." Nay, the English politician who should shrink from sacrificing (if possible) the "glory and greatness" of all other nations to the "glory and greatness" of England, would be "an infamous traitor."

It is only fair to add the sentence which follows, as that may be considered to express more clearly the writer's meaning. "The human race is so large," he adds, "and its interests are so complicated, that the only possible way by which men and nations can really promote its interests is by the old rule of minding your own business." But the preceding sentences strictly determine the word "interests" as here signifying "lasting glory and greatness." The politicians of every nation should occupy themselves paramountly in forwarding that nation's "glory and greatness," and defending it against all other nations.

We pointed out more than five years ago (July 1863, p. 92), that "the pursuit of national *good* tends to international *union*, but the pursuit of national *greatness* to international *discord*." If the "Pall Mall Gazette" principle were admitted, those would be the most approved patriots, who should be most busy in promoting wars of aggression ; and a politician who should prefer his country's welfare to its greatness, would be next door to a renegade and a traitor. Well, at all events even the school of Mr. Mill protests against such shocking immorality as this.

answer is quite evident. It is quite evident that she will bring no adequate force against this mighty stronghold of the world and the devil, by merely training a few unusually able champions to assail it. And on the other hand, the view she is opposing is so intellectually contemptible, that all youths who receive any education at all, can be taught to see quite clearly its shallowness, hollowness, and humbug. It is "a stronghold of the world and the devil," not at all from any intrinsic strength which it possesses—for never was there a more rotten edifice—but exclusively from the vast numerousness of its garrison. Numbers then must, as far as possible, be opposed by numbers. Let the whole body of educated Catholics be loud and clamorous in their expressions of hatred and contempt for that pitiful imposture, the anti-Catholic standard of morality,—there is some chance that one of its upholders after another may come to be ashamed of it. It is utterly incapable of any intellectual defence, which is even plausible: to examine it is to abandon it: its strength consists in the number of its adherents. But unless Catholics train numbers to oppose numbers, the few deep thinkers may protest in vain to the end of time.

What has been said on this fundamental question, applies in its degree to others also. No sufficient impression can be made on the non-Catholic intellect by a few isolated thinkers contending against the current. The whole body of educated Catholics should exhibit themselves as animated by one spirit of abhorrence for the prevalent anti-Catholic speculations and views, and of intelligent zeal for the Catholic verities opposed thereto. This is one very principal purpose of Catholic higher education.

It would fill a volume if we attempted to express in detail the various matters, philosophical, historical, and the like, on which the opinions now dominant in England (for to England we are confining our view) are in various degrees contradictory or dangerous to the Faith. We have already stated one of these, the prevalent standard of virtuousness. We will select a very few more, exclusively from the spheres of philosophy and history.

The present spirit of English philosophy is, beyond the possibility of doubt, atheistic; indeed, we are not aware of any Theistic school which has of late exhibited philosophical life. Dr. M'Cosh indeed individually, writing from Ireland, has done real service so far as his influence has extended; and it gave us great pleasure to insert a communicated article in January, 1867, which did some justice to the doctrines of this

distinguished and Christian-spirited teacher. In one of our "notices" again we draw attention to a reaction which seems at last setting in, and refer particularly to Mr. Martineau, Dr. Thompson, and Mr. Maurice; but Mr. Martineau himself speaks of the atheistic view as that "now prevalent in the schools." Nor, lastly, do we by any means forget the labours of Sir W. Hamilton and Dean Mansel, who really *have* in some sense founded a school. We are well aware how highly some English Catholics think of these philosophers: though, on the other hand, it is quite possible for Catholics to hold—in fact we ourselves hold—that Sir W. Hamilton's principles, at all events in the shape given them by Dean Mansel, involve practical atheism.\* At all events, it is not Dr. M'Cosh, Mr. Martineau, and Dean Mansel who now influence the minds of thinking Englishmen, but rather such writers as Mr. Mill, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and Mr. Bain. The "Month" of October, 1868, quotes (p. 400) an impartial writer as testifying that, at the London University philosophical examinations, a knowledge of Sir W. Hamilton's works would be almost useless. Again, if there were any place in England where Theistic philosophy would be likely to retain its existence, it would be at Oxford; yet we mentioned in our last number—and that on unimpeachable authority—that it is only Mr. Mill and the German pantheists whose works tell in the Oxford schools (p. 425). It is most evident that immeasurably less harm would be done by leaving our Catholic youths as they are, than by any middle course; than by giving them on the one hand a higher education and so a taste for philosophical studies, without supplying them on the other hand with a vigorous and satisfactory Theistic philosophy, fitted to meet the questions now raised in this country.

Remarks altogether similar may be made on the doctrine of Free Will, and on the theory of moral obligation. The "Month" for October, 1868, in the article which we have so often quoted, points out (p. 400) a question proposed by the London University examiners, which implied in its very expression, as quite a matter of course, that "moral rules" are certainly founded either "on sentiment" or on "views of utility." Again the Duke of Argyll, who is very far from being an extreme partisan, speaks of the necessitarian doctrine as one which all who know their own mind would at once hold not only as a

---

\* It can hardly be necessary to explain that we never dreamed of doubting Dean Mansel's most firm belief in a Personal All-holy God. We refer in the text exclusively to what we consider the legitimate outcome of his philosophical principles.

truth but as a truism. (See our number for April, 1867, pp. 414-425; and our last number, pp. 555-6.) But let false principles be imbibed by a Catholic on Free Will or on moral obligation, his fall from the Faith is but a matter of time and accident: he holds the premisses of apostacy, and may at any moment draw the conclusion.

We have been urging, as it was important to urge, the profoundly anti-Theistic character of English philosophy as a whole. But we must not for a moment be suspected of conceding what we would rather die than concede. Let us suppose, for argument's sake, that English philosophy at the present day were in as satisfactory a state as non-Catholic philosophy can possibly be; even on that supposition, our general argument would not be affected. As the "Month" ably points out, philosophy is considered by the Church "ancillary to theology," and indissolubly bound up therewith. "The difficulties which beset the latter emerge generally first in the former; and therefore her guidance and restraint are no less necessary in the one than in the other." (p. 397.) Never would she permit her children to be taught such a subject by an alien body, or permit them to consider the verdict of such a body as any test whatever of their proficiency therein.

As we are only professing to give a few illustrations out of the large number available, we shall here leave the theme of philosophy. We will only remind our readers in passing, that that vital controversy on which we spoke so earnestly, concerning the standard of human virtuousness, is in itself a philosophical controversy, though its practical bearing extends also most widely over the regions of history, literature, and the like.

Next then on the sphere of history. We have just pointed out how profoundly irreligious are English historical treatises, in their view of man, his end, and his proper work; and how intimately and indissolubly that irreligiousness pervades their whole texture. But they are no *less* profoundly anti-Catholic in their view of the Church, her mission, and her success. Those same facts which the carefully instructed Catholic reads as teaching one lesson, are so handled by contemporary literature that they shall inculcate the very opposite. "Put history," says Dr. Murray (p. 258), "into the hands of a rationalist" — and now-a-days in England nearly all non-Catholic thinkers are rationalists — "put history into the hands of a man of this kind, the era of Hildebrand or Charlemagne or Luther, and its colour will be completely changed without the apparent distortion of a single substantial fact;

*as the earth at midnight is that which basked a few hours ago in the meridian sun."* Every age, since Christ came upon earth, is (as the French say) "denaturalized" and distorted by the Protestant historian. The Apostles, the ante-Nicenes, the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, the mediævalists, —all are made the victims of consistent and elaborate misrepresentation. We do not ascribe intentional misrepresentation to the general body of Protestant historians: far from it. But they can no more appreciate Catholic men and periods, than a blind man can discern the gradations of colour. Nor on the other hand are they much more trustworthy expositors of heathendom than of Christianity: witness the contrast between Merivale and Champagny. In vain, except from Catholic teaching, will students look for true guidance on the real value of heathen civilizations and of heathen morality.

We may mention one pervading feature in particular. If there is one doctrine more uniformly assumed by Protestants than another as the simplest matter of course, it is that liberty of worships and of the press confer a real benefit on society. The civilization of one period, in comparison with another, is commonly measured by the degree of "toleration" respectively prevalent in the two. Now this doctrine has again and again been condemned by the Church in every variety of shape. Indeed there is hardly a Pontifical Act that can be named, as we have repeatedly argued, in regard to which there are such multifarious and incontrovertible proofs of its *ex cathedrâ* and infallible character, as the "*Mirari vos.*" Listen to its emphatic lessons:—

And from this most corrupt source of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather insanity (*deliramentum*), that liberty of conscience is to be asserted and vindicated for every man (*asserendam esse ac vindicandam cuique libertatem conscientiae*). To which *most pestilent error* a way is prepared by that full and unrestrained liberty of opinions which is spreading far and wide to the ruin both of religious and civil interests; while some men say, in the extremity of impudence (*per summan impudentiam*), that some advantage flows from it to the cause of religion. But "what worse death is there of the soul," said Augustine, "than liberty of error?" In fact, all those reins being removed whereby men are kept in the paths of truth, their nature (which of itself is inclined to evil) now rushing madly towards destruction (*proruente in præceps*) in very truth we see the bottomless pit opened, from which John saw that smoke ascend whereby the sun was darkened, while locusts issued from it to lay waste the earth. For thence arises unsettlement (*immutationes*) of mind; thence the corruption of youth; thence a contempt among the people of sacred things and of the most holy interests and laws; thence arises, in one word, a plague more deadly



to the state than any other, inasmuch as it has been known by experience from the earliest antiquity that nations which flourished in wealth, power, and glory, have fallen by this one evil, unrestrained liberty of opinions, licence of speech, desire of change.

To this may be referred that liberty—most foul and never sufficiently to be execrated and detested—that liberty of the bookselling trade to publish any kind of writings, which some men dare to demand and promote with so much violence (*tanto convicio*). We shudder, venerable brethren, in beholding with what monsters of doctrines, or, rather, with what portents of errors, we are overwhelmed—which are disseminated everywhere far and wide by the immense multitude of books, and by tracts and writings, which are small, indeed, in bulk, but in wickedness very large, and from which a curse has gone forth over the face of the earth which we lament with tears (*e quibus maledictionem egressam illacrymamur super faciem terræ*). But there are some, alas ! who are carried away to that degree of shamelessness, as pugnaciously to assert that the foul mass of errors thence breaking forth is compensated with sufficient abundance (*satis cumulate compensari*) by some book which, in this so great storm of depravity, may be put forth to defend religion and truth. It is sinful, in truth, and condemned by every law, that a certain and greater evil should be purposely inflicted, because there is hope that a certain amount of good will be thence obtained. Would any one in his senses say that poisons should be freely circulated and publicly sold, because something of a remedy is possessed, which is such that it sometimes happen that those who use it are delivered from destruction ?

Such are the principles which the Church has placed before Catholics in an infallible decree, as those by which the facts of history are to be estimated. Liberty of worships and of the press, she teaches, are not in themselves goods, but heavy calamities ; and none the less heavy, because in most parts of Europe they are now preferable to any practicable alternative. The Church's faithful son must read as it were backward the whole rhetoric of Protestant historians. And no one surely will maintain, that he will carry with him such lessons as Gregory XVI.'s from his historical studies, unless special trouble be taken to give him a Catholic historical training. In other words, he will be perverted into an erroneous system of doctrine which the Church has peremptorily condemned, unless those who impart his higher education are assiduously solicitous to inculcate that contradictory doctrine which she teaches as infallibly true.

Both our authors dwell with much force on the terrible evils which must ensue, wherever the interest of young persons has been aroused in secular studies, without the accompanying regulation of carefully inculcated Catholic truth. We italicise the sentences to which we desire especial attention.

Dr. Murray reasons as follows on the results of mixed education :

The great and intrinsic difficulty remains, that the whole course of literary and scientific knowledge is imparted without any reference to religious principles, and without any intermixture of those occasional hints and observations which may be necessary in our day and in these countries to explain the apparent inconsistencies of several of the facts of secular knowledge with the Catholic religion or with revelation in general ; to turn the discoveries of science into evidences, when they are, as they often are, evidences of religion ; to show in all things the harmony between natural and supernatural truth, between the Catholic system and the facts of civil and ecclesiastical history, of philosophy, of the history of philosophy, and of the human mind ; in one word, to make secular knowledge, what it should be, the handmaid of religion, *as it were to baptize it and pour into it the vivifying spirit of a diviner knowledge*, as this inner body is quickened by the immortal spirit hypostatically united to it ; to make the progress and elevation of the mind a progress and elevation in the right direction—towards its last end in God.

I freely admit that a case may be supposed where this union of secular and religious instruction from the same chair, or rather this direction of the secular by the religious, is not at all so necessary, and the proposed end is sufficiently attained without it. For example, suppose a Catholic country where not only the faith is strong as well as universal, but where the desolating indifferentism and monstrous speculations of latter days not only have no place but are in little danger of being introduced ; where consequently the minds of youth *are safe from the influence of an heretical or infidel or sceptical or sensual and mundane literature*, and safe from the contamination of those endless, baseless, shapeless but not less seductive theories which are for ever flashing in our eyes and impregnating the whole atmosphere of thought about us ; and where there is *a permanent, silent, all-pervading influence of Catholic ideas*. In such a country—if such exists now in Europe—I admit that the whole body of science might, without any probable risk, be communicated as drily and as much devoid of religious sentiment, as the modes and figures of syllogism or the five common rules of arithmetic (pp. 231–3).

Nothing can be more notorious than the decidedly anti-Catholic spirit of English literature in all its departments. It has grown up since the reformation in an anti-Catholic soil and an anti-Catholic atmosphere and from an anti-Catholic stem. It is essentially anti-Catholic, tending, wherever it comes in contact with them, to sully, to infect, and utterly to corrupt Catholic feelings and principles. *Sound knowledge, a sound head, strong faith, and great grace combined together* will preserve untainted the minds of those whom the necessities of their position may lead into dangerous pastures. But it were idle to set about proving to Catholic readers the immense influence for evil which such a literature would naturally exercise over the large mass who, without adequate preparation from nature or grace, plunge into it in the pursuit of amusement or knowledge, or of both. The natural action of Protestant ideas on the Catholic mind is not to turn it from the creed of Pius to that of the Thirty-nine Articles, but to unsettle and send it adrift ; to wear or pluck out its principles without putting others in their place ; *to relax and deaden the whole spiritual man*. Moreover, a very large

proportion of our ablest and most attractive books is directly and undisguisedly of an infidel character, or of that low rationalistic form of Protestantism to which I have already alluded, and whose adherents have, of late years, if not increased in numbers, at least assumed a more defined, imposing, and influential attitude (pp. 234, 5).

So our other author :—

Look across the length and breadth of the country ; look at the varieties of unhealthy sects and denominations that spring up, and grow rank like clusters of fungi that revel in an undrained coppice, and render no other service than proclaim the nature of the soil. Read the light literature of the day, from Tennyson's *Vivien* or *Enoch Arden*, to the penny sporting paper, with its notices of pugilistic encounters and dog-fights, and with its still more foul advertisements. Cast your eyes upon the book-stalls in our crowded railway stations,—one broad mass of yellow-ochre, so covered are they with exciting, sensational, and, to say the very best of it, most dubious morality. See the teeming press ; mark its tone ; read its leading articles ; note its favourite topics ; observe its hatred, its fear, of the only really antagonistic power to itself (p. 15).

Read the *Times*, the exponent of the hour, the exponent of the special modifications of the great ruling principle of the day ; open the endless variety of periodicals that, weekly and monthly and quarterly, break into flower ; all growing out of the same earth, all manifesting one identical principle, and yet all declaring and witnessing, one against the other, that they are not the children of absolute truth (pp. 15, 16).

You will find that in this great Babel and bewilderment ; in this endless and dizzying metamorphosis and change ; in this mutability of voice, and of gesture, and of tone, and of principle, and of thought ; in this external manifestation of an internal, energizing life,—this much is certain,—viz., that though, indeed, the manifestations are different,—as the oak differs from the fragile anemone that grows under it,—still, they are all voices of the same great reality, and are but variegated signs of the one great, pervading, energizing, Protestant principle that is, *forma corporis*, the animating spirit of the variety of movements we observe. They are, after all, one consistent whole,—differing indeed, yet receiving their being, their vitality, their force from, knit and dovetailed and jointed together by, that all-pervading principle which has taken possession of the mind of this country, at least, since the days of the twenty-fourth of Henry VIII.

And it may be well here to ask, How does this great organism keep together ? whence comes the power, the food, which renews it with constant life ? whence comes its appalling energy and vigour ? and why should it breathe so freely in this nineteenth century ? I answer, in short : Its tongue is the *Times*, and it maintains its life in "*the University*." It is there this great monster principally feeds, and takes in and masticates, and digests, and converts into blood and bone and muscle and sinew, the food which has been carefully prepared to his English palate at the great proscholia or grammar-schools of the kingdom,—at Eton and Harrow, and Rugby and Winchester,

and Westminster and Shrewsbury, and Marlborough and Wellington, and Merchant Taylors' and Cowbridge, and the Charterhouse and St. Paul's. Indeed, from the first dawn of intelligence, the young mind finds itself under the control of that very same principle which at Oxford and Cambridge manifests itself in its fullest perfection (pp. 16, 17).

Have they [Catholics who wish to be influenced by Oxford] measured the spirit of the times, the freedom of thought, the irreverence of intellect, the mental pride, the impatience of authority, the independence of judgment in things the most sacred and august, the poison that exudes from every pore of the monster University, mixing itself in science, in literature, in society, pouring itself into the minds and the hearts, by its tenderness, its delicacy, its sensitiveness, its refinement, by its gentleness of manner, its charming address, its convincing, reasoning, and embellished style—

“*Impia sub dulci melle venena latent ?*” (p. 34.)

We have been dwelling on that careful and elaborate instruction in the Catholic view of things secular, which is peremptorily needed, unless Catholic higher education is to be an inexpressible calamity. But much more than this is really required: *a certain and not inconsiderable portion of direct doctrinal teaching is absolutely indispensable*, if students are to be retained as loyal Catholics. Dr. Murray's remarks are especially deserving attention on this head:—

Religious knowledge is, both as to extent and kind, painfully low among that very class of young men by whom it is most needed: young men who are destined for some liberal profession; and still more perhaps those who are destined for no particular calling except that of enjoying a comfortable patrimony; and still more, certainly, that very considerable and, in not a few of its members, very influential class of persons, who are by choice or circumstances destined for a merely literary life (p. 240).

When I speak of a deficiency of *religious* knowledge, I do not mean a knowledge of such articles of faith as are of precept to know and believe; nor a knowledge of the usual topics and arguments of what is called religious controversy. . . . . I at present mean by religious knowledge that which implies *a clear and full insight into the spiritual nature and authority and destiny of the Church*; which implies a perception intimate and sound not only of isolated dogmas but of the leading principles of Catholic doctrines and of the *spirit that pervades them and combines them into one perfect whole*; so that one *adequately appreciates their truth and grandeur and connexion with each other and adaptation to the spiritual wants of man*, and, still more, sees in their clear light the utter absurdity of all that contradicts them and the utter deformity of all that caricatures them (pp. 240, 241).

In the present day it is more than ever necessary that those who cultivate secular learning should have acquired a stock of sacred learning sufficient to counteract the tendency to judge the supernatural by the natural, the ways of God by the ways of man, the wisdom that is from above by the wisdom

that is of this world. Such learning is, alas ! rare indeed among those who require it most (p. 243).

It is now more than four years since we ourselves dwelt earnestly on this theme (See Oct. 1864, pp. 377-384); on the amount of religious instruction which should rank as an indispensable part of Catholic higher education. We may be permitted to repeat part of what we then said :—

No Catholic then can consider an education as really liberal, unless it comprise those verities which express the highest and truest of all relations,—the relations between the Creator and the creature, the Church and the world, things eternal and things temporal. Moreover, it is quite proverbial that the mere torpid reception of truth is no adequate educational result. The Catholic cannot be said to have learned those verities to which we just now referred, except in proportion as he may have so mastered them that he views under their light, and estimates by their standard, the whole range of facts which comes within his cognisance, psychological, historical, political, and social (p. 377).

There is no more virulent disease of the intellect—none, we may add, whose remedy more characteristically appertains to the higher education—than the inveterate habit of accepting truth otiosely and speculatively, without practically holding what is professed, or even understanding what is meant by it. . . . This intellectual fault is more or less to be dreaded in all scientific pursuits : but there is no object of knowledge in regard to which it is so flagrant and so prejudicial (and that, as we believe, in consequence of man's moral corruption) as in religious truths. All Catholics, for instance, admit speculatively that one additional grade of spiritual perfection is more valuable than the loftiest intellect, the most aristocratic birth, or the largest wealth : yet some of them continually imply just the opposite of this in the various judgments which they form on the individual events of every-day life ; in their speculation on their children's future ; in their estimate of political events ; and in a thousand other practical ways. They hold one doctrine as a general truth, and they hold a doctrine precisely contradictory on almost every particular which that general truth comprises. And so in the case before us. It is very easy, no doubt, to induce a Catholic student to accept speculatively such truths regarding the Church's office and claims as those which we stated above ; but as it is very easy, so also it is very useless. What we need is, that those great truths shall spread fruitfully through his whole intellect, not remain barren in one little corner of it ; that they shall habitually affect his whole attitude of mind towards Rome and towards England ; that they shall pervade his views of history, of politics, of literature ; that they shall be his very stand-point for estimating the whole range of social phenomena (pp. 382-3).

It is impossible, within our limits, to enter on any detailed statement as to the character and extent of this doctrinal instruction : we must content ourselves with two remarks. It would differ in many important respects from the professional teaching received by clerics, and would, of course, be

contained in much smaller compass ; while it would include, nevertheless, some real and careful study of the great Catholic verities, in their relation to each other, to the dicta of reason, and to the facts of experience. On the other hand, the bearing of Catholicity on the various secular sciences would be imparted much more fully to these laymen than to ordinary clerics, from the very fact that with the former secular science is so far more prominent a pursuit (p. 379).

Here then we bring to a close what we had to say on the second and most important particular which—as we earnestly submit—should be carefully secured in all Catholic higher education worthy the name: we mean the effective and vigorous inculcation of religious truths, both speculative and practical. We have argued that for Catholics to receive a higher education of which this should not be an integral part, would be an immeasurably greater calamity than for them to receive no higher education at all.

The third and last principle of Catholic higher education on which we would insist, is its bringing the student into as close contact as possible with his contemporary fellow-countrymen. This must by absolute necessity be done, unless Catholics are prepared to give up all idea of intellectually influencing the non-Catholic mind, and to aim at no other end than that of protecting their own children from perversion. A Catholic of this country, when he grows up, will have active dealings with men of the nineteenth, not of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries ; and with Englishmen rather than with Italians, French, or Germans. But he cannot influence these—he cannot take up a position of intellectual equality with them—unless his culture has been similar to theirs. Every time and place has its own peculiarities ; and those who are not able to appreciate those peculiarities, cannot leave their mark on the age. When S. Thomas, e. g., wrote his “*Summa*,” formal logic was the chief recognized means for discovering and ascertaining truth. Even had he been exceptionally gifted with such knowledge of criticism and history as is now common, his treatise would not have influenced his contemporaries had it prominently exhibited those accomplishments. On the other hand—invaluable as is the study of the “*Summa*” to a theologian—no one will say that Catholics intellectually trained on its exclusive model could properly play their part in modern society. We expressed this principle towards the beginning of our article. It is of less importance, we said, that the intellectual discipline of Catholics be in itself the very best attainable, than that it be similar in character to that elsewhere prevalent in England. Even if it were true—we think it most false—that physical science afforded a better intellectual discipline than classics



and mathematics, so long as Protestants are trained on the latter basis, it is important that Catholics should in that respect resemble them.

The principle which we are defending will be so readily admitted by all, that two brief illustrations will amply suffice. The present idea of *historical* study, e. g., is very far deeper and truer than that which prevailed a century ago. That study is now founded throughout on facts ascertained by strict and searching criticism; every contemporary authority is examined in order that those facts may be set forth in their picturesque fulness as they actually took place; and they are carefully compared and co-ordinated with each other, with a view to trustworthy scientific conclusions. It is by historical studies so conceived that the Faith is assailed: it is by historical studies so conceived that the Faith must be defended.

Our second illustration shall be from philosophy. In Italy, Belgium, and Germany, serious danger is to be dreaded from the error called ontologism: from that false, shallow, and sceptical system, which maintains that man cannot obtain the knowledge of necessary truth, unless God be presented directly to his mind as an object of thought. Of course Catholic students, in England no less than elsewhere, must be duly guarded against this and all other errors: we would only urge, that in this country the philosophical error to be *chiefly* dreaded is not ontologism, but another quite different. There are very few Englishmen, Catholic or Protestant, who hold that the mind thinks of God before it can think of anything else: but there are great numbers who maintain that there is no such thing as *necessary* truth at all, either thought of or existing. This is the fatal philosophical error of our time in England, and it is the fruitful parent of a large atheistic progeny. We venture to maintain—submitting our opinion with much deference to those whose office it is practically to decide—that there is no philosophical doctrine in which English students should be more carefully and elaborately trained, than in all which concerns necessary truth: the proofs that such truth exists; the full bearing and import of the term; the various further philosophical truths, a knowledge of which will result from our holding it; the absolute scepticism which must ensue from its denial.

Now, no Catholic philosophers whatever deny either the existence of necessary truth or man's power of knowing it; for those who deny this can be no Theists. Nor again can there be any Catholic philosophers who, if questioned, would deny the indispensable necessity of Catholics rightly appre-

hending all those doctrines which concern necessary truth.\* But on the Continent of Europe they often write with the fear of ontologism before their eyes, as of the great threatening danger. Consequently they often lay by far their principal stress on proving the undoubted verity, that man's conviction of necessary truth does not arise from his direct thought of God. They are far more occupied, we say, with enlarging on this, than with explaining what *is* the true and sufficient basis of the above-named all-important conviction. In so writing, it is very possible that they judge rightly on the philosophical needs of their own respective countries. On this we can form no judgment. But we would earnestly submit, that here in England a different course is imperatively called for.

We have now said all which appeared essential, on the three principles which we desire to recommend. A good Catholic higher education, we have argued, (1) will duly cultivate and invigorate the various faculties; (2) will adequately imbue the students with Catholic truth, both as to religious doctrine, and as to things primarily secular; and (3) will specially perform the task of training its recipients to exercise intellectual influence on their non-Catholic fellow-countrymen. We are far from denying of course that there are other principles, of greater or less importance, to be carried in mind; but we think it is these three which bear prominently on the critical and cardinal questions of practice, which will certainly arise.

Here therefore we should naturally conclude; for our purpose has been, as we said at starting, to speak in our present article of principles and not of their application. But the "*Month*" has so many admirable remarks in the article which we have repeatedly quoted—and has generally indeed done so much service by drawing attention again and again to the great momentousness of the subject—that its practical recommendations will naturally and legitimately carry with them considerable weight. There is on this account greater danger, lest the particular plan which it has brought forward may find acceptance, for a brief space of time, with some of its readers. We are unwilling therefore to delay, even for a quarter, entering against that plan our earnest and emphatic protest. We well know of course that the writer has had no other motive, than that of making a suggestion

---

\* It is sometimes thought by their opponents that upholders of the scholastic philosophy deny the existence of self-evident necessary truth. But on the contrary no writers can by possibility more expressly testify the existence of such truth than do Kluitgen in Germany, and Canon Walker in England.

which at least appears *practicable*, on a matter more surrounded with practical difficulties than perhaps any other of the time. But we confidently cherish the hope, that on maturer reflection he will himself see how serious is the peril, to which he would expose the highest Catholic interests. His proposal is to agitate for the admission of non-resident candidates to Oxford and Cambridge degree examinations, with the view of Catholic students thither resorting.

To discuss this proposal point by point and in its practical details, is a task which we must reserve for our future article ; but it will not be entirely out of place here, to exhibit what we consider the fundamental fallacy of its principle. The writer seems to forget, that on all the most critical and important matters which fall under the province of higher education, Catholics and non-Catholics are irreconcilably hostile ; are waging against each other internecine war. It does seem an extraordinary thought, to suggest that we constitute our enemies judges of our proficiency in the use of those arms, which we are learning to handle for the avowed purpose of mortally wounding the proposed judges themselves. They will be certainly very unwilling to confess, even in their own thoughts, that their deadly foe is equally skilled in the use of his weapon with their trusted defender.

Let us give an imaginary instance, as illustrating what we mean ; an instance which we consider entirely parallel. In those days when the war between Catholicity and Calvinism was at its highest, and in some country most preponderatingly Calvinistic, a Catholic suggests that Catholic theological students shall compete in theology with Calvinists before Calvinistic examiners. He assures his co-religionists that the examination turns entirely on the question of theological ability and information, not at all on that of theological *truth*. He dwells on the paucity of Catholics in the kingdom, and their consequent deficiency in means for adequate competition ; and entreats them to supply that defect by the method which he suggests. It is very certain that ecclesiastical authorities would turn a deaf ear on such a proposal : nor do we think it probable that they will be at all *more* favourably disposed to the present.

This is the objection of principle which occurs at the very first blush. As to details and particulars, we are confident that the more this plan is examined the more open it will be found to most serious exception ; we are confident that it can have no effect except that of inflicting most deadly injury on the very cause which its originator desires to promote. But on this we are to insist in our future article.

## ART. V.—THE CHURCH AND NAPOLEON I.

*L'Eglise Romaine et le Premier Empire* 1800–1814. Par M. LE COMTE D'HAUSSONVILLE. 3 vols., 8vo. Paris. Lévy. 1868.

THE three volumes before us are a reprint of the part which has already appeared of a series of articles in the *Revue des deux Mondes*. We have still to expect the continuation, which will fill at least one, if not more additional volumes, and the three now published leave us (as is so often the case with the second volume of a novel) exactly in the most exciting crisis of the narrative. Still, although we feel an eagerness for the remainder of the work, which could hardly be much greater if the conclusion of the struggle it relates were not already known to all the world, we are not disposed to wait for it before introducing our readers to the portion which has already appeared. The fact is, that a very large part of the details of the narrative are new, not only to English but even to French readers. We must confess that we were quite unprepared to suspect the existence of so many hitherto unpublished sources of information as the diligence of M. D'Haussonville has discovered. Looking at the volumes of M. Thiers, as multitudinous and massive as they are eloquent and lively, and still more at the one and twenty vast tomes of the Napoleon correspondence, published by order of the present emperor, which contain the portion of his uncle's letters written before 1811, we supposed that diligence, fairness, skill, and judgment in working quarries in these great mountains of facts, was all that could be required of him who should give, in a separate form, the history of Napoleon's dealings with the Church. Such, however, was not the case. M. Thiers, although, as a matter of course, he relates what may be called the public and external events, apparently does not understand, and certainly does not state or explain, the principles and motives which, on the side of the Pope, were the real causes of these events. The Napoleon correspondence, if it were complete, would of course give all that could be desired on the side of the emperor. Unfortunately, it is not complete. What other documents are omitted intentionally or not, we cannot say. That those which throw most light upon the conduct of Napoleon towards the Pope have been omitted, not

because their importance was not appreciated, but expressly because they revealed facts which the authorities of the second Empire think it most prudent to conceal—M. D'Haussonville proves to demonstration. It appears that the charge of publishing the invaluable documents preserved in the different official registers of Paris and elsewhere, was committed, by Napoleon III., to a commission, at the head of which was placed his cousin, Prince Jerome Napoleon. This commission were to publish the documents entire, and M. D'Haussonville bears testimony to the fidelity with which they performed their task. But, after fifteen volumes had appeared, the old commission was cancelled and a new one issued. What change was made in the members of the commission we are not told. Prince Napoleon was still President. But a more important change was made. In the Preface to the sixteenth volume of the correspondence they declare that, in future, it will be their object to publish only those documents which present such a picture of Napoleon as the commissioners believe that he himself would have wished to have presented to posterity, if he could have survived to see the publication. Perhaps no man ever lived who would have wished that such a disclosure of his conduct and motives should be wholly complete and fair. However that may be, it is most certain that Napoleon I. was not that man. All the world knew before, what certainly no reader of the volumes before us could fail to learn if he had not already known it, that at every period of his life, whether in war or peace, falsehood of the grossest and most outrageous character, was the instrument which he used most freely, naturally, and spontaneously. In war, we have been told, all stratagems are allowed. This military maxim, it seems, had so completely occupied the whole soul of Napoleon I. that he applied it not merely to military affairs, but to all in which he took any part. It is truly surprising that although his vast genius enabled him to perceive, by a happy instinct, almost every other propriety of the exalted rank to which he had raised himself, yet never at any period of his greatness, not even when he was, and loved to call himself, Emperor, not of France, but of the West; when Kings and Queens, the representatives of the proudest dynasties, accounted themselves honoured by being allowed to follow him at the most deferential distance; never, even then, did he consider it beneath his dignity to practise, in his own person, the most humiliating frauds, and solemnly to utter in his own person falsehoods which, if he wished them to be told, he might at least have left to some subordinate agent. The sovereign who had the absolute command of such a tool as Fouché was clearly

under no necessity to take this portion at least of his dirty work into his own hands. Yet, immediately after the peace of Tilsit, when every European power, except England, was at his feet; and when he had attained a greatness quite without example since the reign of Charlemagne, we find Napoleon condescending to write a letter to his adopted son, Eugene Beauharnais, his viceroy in Italy, in which he attempted, by the most violent threats, to shake the resolution of Pius VII. This letter to the viceroy he was to copy; and to enclose it in another addressed in his own name to the Pope. But Napoleon would not trust him to compose it. He wrote every word of the letter from Eugene to the Pope, with his own hand. Eugene was only to copy and sign it. It began, "I inclose to your Holiness an extract from a long letter which I have received from my most honoured father and Sovereign at Dresden. Your Holiness will permit me to say, that the disputes raised at Rome are calculated to provoke a great Monarch, who is deeply penetrated with religious sentiments, and who feels the immense services which he has rendered to religion in France, in Italy, in Germany, in Poland, and in Saxony. He is well aware that the world regards him as the column of the Christian faith, and the enemies of religion as a Prince who has restored to the Catholic religion in Europe the supremacy she had lost." After some more language of this sort was to come the Emperor's letter to the Prince, and then Eugene, once more in his own name, was to write; "*Holy Father, this letter was not intended to be sent to the eyes of your Holiness!*" Napoleon ended the whole in his own name to his adopted son, "You will send this letter to the Pope, and write to me at Paris."

It is plain enough that Napoleon was the last man to scruple about giving a false impression of his conduct and motives, and that no rule could less conduce to historical truth than that of publishing only what he would wish to have been published had he still survived. But this applies specially to his correspondence with Pius VII. and his ministers. Upon this point we are not left to conjecture, for we find that \* "*Napoleon thought fit to cause a great number of papers relating to his dealings with the Holy See to be burned; no doubt because he considered them injurious to his reputation. This was executed at Rome by General Miollis, at Paris by the chief of the archives of the late office of Secretary of State. But authentic copies of these curious documents have escaped destruction.*" Of these copies large use is made in the

---

\* Vol. ii., p. 298.



volumes before us, and page after page there are letters painting most graphically the scenes going on at Rome, and in particular the orders and wishes of Napoleon himself. But to almost every one of these extracts is a footnote: "Not included in the Napoleon correspondence."

Hence it is that to almost every one of the most curious events of which he gives us the details, M. D'Haussonville adds that it has been hitherto quite unknown in France. In many instances the facts most clearly proved by these documents are among those most exactly contrary to the positive statements of Napoleon in the reminiscences which he dictated to his companions in exile in St. Helena. As a striking example, we may mention his statement that "at no time were more than fifty-three priests under restraint (*retenus*), in consequence of the dispute with Rome, and in their case the restraint was exceedingly slight." Upon this assertion our author says:—

Following my constant custom, I undertake to make Napoleon refute himself, and that by his own letters, the authentic copies of which lie before me. True, they are not included in the official correspondence of Napoleon; but I am sure that the persons who have not thought it expedient to publish them (no doubt because they exhibit the Emperor in a different light from that in which he would have wished to be represented to posterity) will feel it even less expedient to contradict them. When the Emperor put down this exact number of fifty-three priests, who were the only ecclesiastics "put under restraint" (*retenus*), in consequence of the dispute with Rome, he had no doubt forgotten (such things are easily forgotten) that, without counting any of those who may have been "*put under restraint*," in virtue of his general orders, he had, with his own hand, given orders to put under restraint, in Italy alone, a number infinitely greater. I suppose it was a similar failure of memory, less easily explained in that case, which induced the editors of the official correspondence to omit these orders, so numerous and so ruthless.

He then shows that in a single year Napoleon himself gave express orders by which, in the Roman States only, thirteen cardinals, nineteen bishops, and "a multitude of canons and grand vicars, the number of which it is difficult to ascertain," were sent from Rome to France, and placed under restraint, under the surveillance of the imperial police in different provincial towns, and, moreover, above two hundred priests were transported to Corsica. (Napoleon by no means considered the island where he was born a paradise.) The number arbitrarily arrested in France itself, and thrown without trial into different prisons, no one can now estimate. Of this last

practice also the author gives numerous examples from letters "not published in the correspondence of Napoleon I."

We have said enough to show that M. D'Haussonville is no indiscriminate admirer of all that was said and done by Napoleon I. The fact that his work has appeared in the "*Revue des deux Mondes*," that its publication has not been interrupted, and that he is now allowed to republish it in a separate form, is the strongest illustration of the immense difference between the present system, which places the press of France under the control of law, (although of law which in England would be accounted most oppressive,) and that which subjected it to "avertissements." We are very sure that a very few years ago no journal would have dared to publish this work. That such a work should have obtained any degree of popularity in France illustrates another fact hardly less important—how much the popularity of the name of Napoleon I. has been diminished (at least among the more educated classes) within the last few years. Under the restoration he came to be looked back upon only as the conqueror who had so often led the armies of France to victory.

All the suffering which in every country affects many classes after the close of a long war, and which was so severely felt in England in 1816, 1817, &c., was naturally laid to the score of the Bourbons. They were accused of having lowered France from the pinnacle of glory to which he had raised it. It was the name of Napoleon that carried the election of the present Emperor, first as President then as Emperor. As Frenchmen have become weary of a rule which they connect with that of Napoleon I., they have become more willing to examine how far his "glory" was a real benefit to France. We suspect this feeling has not to any very considerable degree spread among the peasantry; that it has become general in the higher classes we are sure.

If France at all resembles England, it is quite possible that this reaction against the blind idolatry of Napoleon which formerly prevailed, may, at least for a time, go farther than reason warrants. For, assuredly, however we may feel the deep moral degradation of his character, his genius will ever be more and more highly appreciated as we more minutely study his life. M. D'Haussonville is far from underrating it. His whole narrative brings Napoleon before us in the strongest relief, as a man able with almost equal ease to grasp every subject to which it was his interest to turn his attention; who detected with an unerring instinct the peculiar gifts and character of every man with whom he had any dealings, and saw with the eye of genius whom he could employ, and for what

purpose; and of whom it may be much doubted whether, in any one instance, he was mistaken. Until his head had been turned by a prosperity and glory such as, perhaps, no other man ever attained, he was, alike in every relation of war, politics, legislation, and diplomacy, as wary as he was daring. That he had to do with the weakest opponent never seems to have appeared to him a reason for neglecting any one precaution which could have been necessary against the strongest. When he had made up his mind to seize Rome, although the Pope was without any means of resistance, although he was himself distant from it by half a continent, and although he had brave, able, and trustworthy servants on the spot, he thought it necessary exactly to prescribe in writing all the most minute particulars of the combinations desirable for the purpose; to arrange exactly the number of men to be despatched from the north of Italy, and the number from Naples, the days on which they were to arrive at the different points, and how they were to combine. With characteristic disregard of truth and honour, he detailed the falsehoods to be communicated at different parts of the proceeding to the Government of the Holy Father, and gave especial orders that, as soon as his troops had entered Rome, supposing the people to submit in quiet, the French Minister was to give a ball, to which the chief ladies of Rome and the French officers were to be invited; and that meanwhile all measures were to be taken, by placing French soldiers in the post-office and every other public office, to accustom the Romans to see the administration of their city in the hands of the French. Should any resistance arise, it was at once and sternly to be put down by grape-shot. All this time he continued to assure the Pope's Government, first that his troops were merely passing through the States of the Church on their way to Naples, and were not to enter Rome; and when they had entered it, that they had come merely to seize some brigands, who were devastating the Neapolitan States, and who found refuge under the Pope's Government. Those who have read the similar complaints against the administration of Pius IX. which have been so loudly made by the Roman correspondents of London newspapers for the last few years, will not be surprised to hear, that when Rome had been occupied on this pretence, not so much as one person there was even charged with being a brigand. The pretence had served its purpose, and was quietly laid aside. In short, it is impossible to read M. D'Haussonville's narrative without feeling that, for the purpose of silently occupying Rome, the great Emperor thought it worth while to lavish all his genius and all his treachery, as

freely as when, nearly at the same time, he allured the royal family of Spain into his trap at Bourdeaux.

No doubt, the circumstances of the revolutionary era afforded him a matchless opportunity of action, but never was there a man whose success, and we may also say whose fall, was more wholly his own.

Almost every real mistake that he ever made may be traced to a moral, not an intellectual defect. There was one exception to the penetrating power with which his eagle eye penetrated and appreciated the character of all with whom he had to do. When he had to do with men to whom conscience and the fear and love of God were not mere specious words, but realities by which their lives were governed, his penetration failed him, for he was morally incapable of realizing the existence of such a character. No reader of the volumes before us can doubt that this moral incapacity was the one cause of every serious mistake into which he fell. In dealing, for instance, with Pius VII. and with Consalvi, he overreached himself: because he could not find it possible to believe that in their minds their own interests, however serious, so far from being the leading consideration, actually had no place at all when their duty to God and the Church was in question. It was only this incapacity to conceive of conscience as a real governing principle, which led him to commit himself to a contest with the Church, from which, when it had once begun, his pride and his interest alike forbade him to draw back. He had never imagined that he was bringing himself into collision with men who could not be moved either by munificent bribes or by tremendous threats; and that he should really be compelled either to give up that to which he had publicly committed himself, or else to push matters to the last extremities of violence and open tyranny. And thus he found himself involved unawares in a struggle, in which it was simply impossible that he should prevail, and yet in which he was afraid, as well as ashamed, to be defeated. It was this moral defect alone which blinded him to a danger, of which thousands of poor peasants in his dominions could have warned him. For they were conscious of what he, with all his genius, did not know,—the truth expressed by Pius IX. in words which have echoed through the world, *Non Possumus*, and which Pius VII. stated to the diplomatist, a real though unavowed agent of Napoleon, sent to sound him in his prison at Savona:—"When opinions are founded on the voice of conscience and the sense of duty, they become unalterable. Believe me, there is in this world no physical force

which can, in the long-run, contend with a moral force of this nature." Napoleon had hoped to find the purpose of the gentle, aged monk altered by long imprisonment and separation from his friends and counsellors. His agent, on bringing him back this answer, added that "he had found the Pope a little aged, but not unwell, calm, unruffled as ever, and without a tinge of bitterness in his remarks, even when speaking of the subjects which it was impossible that he should fail to feel most acutely." It is exactly against moral force such as this that physical force is utterly powerless.

This is, in truth, the one subject of the volumes before us. It is the history of a physical force utterly irresistible, breaking itself in the vain effort to overcome the force of conscience and the power of grace; that is, to conquer Him who lives in the Christian's heart. It divides itself naturally into two parts, separate in the main, although one sometimes runs into the other—Napoleon's relations to Rome and to the Catholics of France. His relations to Rome have the unity of an epic. They begin with the election of Pius VII. to the Chair of S. Peter in the conclave at Venice in the beginning of the year 1800, and end only with his own downfall. The present volumes, as we have said, continue the narrative only to January, 1811. Eleven years seem to a man who looks back after he has passed middle life but as a few days. But in those years were developed a series of events the most wonderful in modern history. When the history commences, the House of Austria, in full possession of the dignity and prestige of the Holy Roman Empire, was mistress of Italy, and in actual possession of the greater part of the States of the Church. Naples, virtually her vassal, held the remainder; and neither power made any secret of its resolution to keep permanently what it had got. The Austrian intrigues at the Conclave were aimed expressly at this object; and when, by a remarkable series of events, very well related by our author, the election fell, against the will of Austria, upon Pius VII., the resolution was at once shown to make him a mere tool of the Empire, and especially to refuse to give up the Legations. The whole position both of Austria and Naples towards the Pope was changed by one event—the Battle of Marengo. France, not Austria, became once more mistress of Italy; and for fourteen years it was from France, and France alone, that the Holy See had anything to fear. Napoleon's first measures were intended to gain the confidence of the Catholics of Italy, and they succeeded. He assured the clergy of the Milanese that when he had come into Italy two years before as a General under the Directory, he had been unable to adopt

a policy of his own—that as First Consul he was now master.

All the changes then made, chiefly in discipline, were opposed to my views and wishes. As the mere instrument of a government which cared nothing for the Catholic religion, I was then unable to prevent the disorders which it was bent on stirring up, cost what they might, with the view of overthrowing it. Now I have full powers. I have resolved to employ every instrument which seems to me calculated to give security and confidence to that religion. France has been educated by her sufferings. Her eyes are at length opened ; she perceives that the Catholic religion is the only anchor which can keep her steady on the troubled waves, and save her from the tempest. She has invited it again to her bosom. In this good work I cannot conceal the fact that I have had a great share. I can assure you that the churches of France have been re-opened, that the Catholic religion is resuming its ancient dignity, and that the people look with reverence upon the consecrated pastors who are returning full of zeal to the midst of their abandoned flocks. As soon as I have an opportunity of communicating with the new Pope, I hope to have the happiness of removing every obstacle which could possibly stand in the way of the entire reconciliation of France with the Head of the Church. I shall be glad that the public should be informed, through the press, of the sentiments by which I am animated, that it may be known, not only in Italy and France, but in all Europe, what my dispositions are.

No wonder that Catholic Italy threw itself with delight into the arms of a young hero who, in the moment of his most brilliant triumph, reversed without delay thus publicly, the fatal policy on which France had been acting for more than eight years. Hitherto, wherever the French troops took possession, the clergy had been driven out and persecuted. Foreign nations had seen the most venerable of the French clergy seeking in exile a precarious maintenance from the charity of surrounding nations, and had heard from them that they were themselves but the remnant which had escaped the guillotine. What a consolation such words as these from the mouth of the man who, almost at the same moment, had made himself master of France, and France mistress of Italy ! Nor had the Italian clergy any reason to doubt that Bonaparte was a sincere Catholic. He was of a family Italian, Catholic, and religious. It is difficult for us to divest ourselves of the memory of his subsequent actions sufficiently to judge of him as Italian Catholics in 1800 necessarily judged. They did not, like us, know even the past—for instance, that he had made a profession of belief in Islamism equally satisfactory to the ulemas of Egypt only the year before.

The next measure of the First Consul was to bring about the



“Concordat.” M. D’Haussonville relates, very graphically, all the steps towards it—the negotiations, first at Rome, and afterwards at Paris. It was to his first negotiator at Rome, M. Cacault, that Napoleon gave the celebrated injunction, “Remember to treat the Pope as if he had two hundred thousand men at his command.” Unfortunately, with him was joined another negotiator, a priest whose antecedents led men to trust him, for he had been among the most influential leaders of the royalist peasantry in La Vendée; but who was undeserving of their confidence. This is the same person who, being made Bishop of Orleans on the conclusion of the Concordat, distinguished himself by the basest subserviency to Napoleon, and whose disgrace, if we remember rightly, has been noted by the pen of the distinguished prelate who now sits in his seat. The unworthy conduct of this man, and of Cardinal Caprara, who was long Legate at Paris, no doubt contributed to confirm Napoleon in the fatal opinion that “every man has his price,” and so to lead him into his worst errors. We cannot follow M. D’Haussonville through these negotiations. When Napoleon found that he did not get his own way, he threatened to invade the States of the Church, and found that the threat produced no effect. He then threatened to lead France into schism, and even to make it Protestant. In his calmer moments, disposed as he always was to reckon on his power, he felt that this exceeded it. “To his most trusted counsellor,” he said that:—

It would be a folly to join himself to the constitutional bishops and priests. Their influence was gone. They could lend him no force; still, they do very well to threaten Consalvi with. To put himself at the head of a separate Church, to make himself Pope, for him a man of war in his sword and spurs, would be simply impossible. Would they have him make himself hated like Robespierre, or laughed at like Laréveillère Lepeaux? To make France Protestant! Easily said, no doubt. But everything cannot be done in France, say what they may; even he could do nothing except by going with real feelings. The Catholic was the ancient religion of the land. Half France at least would remain Catholic, and there would be no end of disputes and divisions. The people must have a religion, and that religion must be in the hands of the Government (Vol. i., p. 107).

Still, neither to the Pope nor his minister did he confess even so much as this, and it would be a serious responsibility to push him, by insisting upon anything which could lawfully be conceded, into a renewal of the persecution which had hardly ceased, or even into a schism like that of the constitutional clergy. A powerful Monarch, quite reckless of the welfare of souls, is, no doubt, always at a great advantage in

dealing with a Pontiff with whom the good of souls is a primary consideration.

One point upon which there was much difficulty, but which the Pope ultimately conceded, was whether the Concordat should declare Catholicism the religion of the State, or only that of the vast majority of the French people. At last, after long debates and many delays, the terms of the Concordat were settled, and Napoleon agreed to withdraw the articles in which he had embodied the Gallican doctrines. Nothing, therefore, remained except to sign : and a meeting was held for that purpose. It had been expressly declared that it was a mere formality, "which would hardly occupy a quarter of an hour." We need hardly tell, what all the world knows, how, at the moment when he was about to put his hand to the document as the representative of the Holy Father, Cardinal Consalvi discovered that Napoleon had attempted a fraud upon him, by substituting for the document to which he had agreed, another containing the obnoxious articles. We must refer to our author for the vivid description of scenes which followed, which are too long to be extracted here.

Napoleon throughout kept up the character of one who united with the highest genius the lowest and most paltry meanness and falsehood. It is universally known that when the Concordat was at last signed, he published it with the rejected articles added to it as if they had been agreed upon. At the same time he attempted another fraud, not so generally known, for, having always given Consalvi to understand that if the Concordat were concluded, he would have nothing to do with the schismatical clergy, except on condition of their making due submission to the Pope; he had no sooner obtained the signature, than he caused one of his agents to mention to the legate, as a matter of course, that as many as possible of "both clergies" (*i. e.* the Catholic and the schismatical) would attend at the *Te Deum* sung for the conclusion at Notre Dame. At the same time he condescended to another trick of the same sort. There had been a dispute whether the legate should take an oath which had formally been required from legates *à latere* in France. The first consul had promised that it should not be required, and in fact it was not. But, to satisfy the Gallicans, a formal notice was officially inserted in the *Moniteur*, asserting that Cardinal Consalvi had taken the oath, which, for greater effect, was printed at full length.

The manner in which the difficulty about the constitutional clergy was got over, was also characteristic of Napoleon. There were two ecclesiastics wholly free from the taint of the

schism, and of unblemished reputation, upon whom, however, Napoleon, with his usual knowledge of character, felt sure that he might rely for any service, however unworthy. These were the Abbés Bernier and Pancemont. They were named by the First Consul for the sees of Orleans and Vannes. The legate, in the name of the Pope, gladly gave them canonical authority and episcopal consecration, and congratulated his Holiness upon the character of these appointments. The bishops who had compromised themselves in the constitutional schism, and whom the First Consul, against the wishes of the legate and against his own promises, had nominated to other sees, had of course been required "explicitly to confess their schism and to abjure their past errors." The bishops of Orleans and Vannes attested that they had made this declaration before themselves, but no sooner had the constitutional bishops obtained canonical investiture than they boasted that they had done nothing of the sort, and that they had even torn into a thousand scraps the letter which had been proposed for their signature in the name of the Holy Father. "Between such opposite assertions," asks our author, "which are we to trust?" Then, after adding that facts are now notorious against the uprightness of M. Bernier, but that nothing was ever alleged to the discredit of M. de Pancement, he adds:—

In such a case there are, in fact, no positive proofs. Still it is with surprise and pain that, in searching among the contemporary documents for the means of forming my own judgment, I found, in the correspondence of Napoleon I., two letters which may perhaps throw an unexpected light upon the conduct of the two prelates. One is a request to M. de Talleyrand to give to the Abbé Bernier a sum of thirty thousand francs (£1,200) out of the secret service money, to assist him in negotiating suitably with the Legate; the other an order to Citizen Portalis to hold at the disposition of M. de Pancement, Bishop of Vannes (without any publicity), the sum of fifty thousand francs (£2,000).

We have mentioned merely a few instances of the affair of the Concordat because they illustrate the character of Napoleon, who certainly was, of all great men in history, the most willing to descend to any littleness, any meanness, any falsehood, any treachery, if it seemed likely to accomplish his ends. The whole course of a matter complicated by many strange intrigues, and extending over many months, is related in a lucid narrative by our author. The publication of the Concordat was long delayed by Napoleon after it was formally signed, partly in consequence of the disputes to which we have alluded, partly for a reason highly characteristic of him.

No man ever thought more of what Englishmen would laugh at as theatrical effects. If he wished to publish a decree against British commerce, it was no mere coincidence which occasioned him to sign it in his head-quarters, at the palace of the King of Prussia, at Berlin; the decree regulating the Opera at Paris was dated from Moscow. In this case, he had set his heart upon publishing the Concordat on the anniversary of the *Coup d'État* by which he had placed himself at the head of the State—the 18th Brumaire (Nov. 9). As soon as this was gone by, instead of pressing the matter forward as he had done all along, he intentionally delayed it. His reason was, that he thought the next best thing would be to publish the Concordat at such a moment that the *Te Deum* at Notre Dame might be sung on Easter day. For that day, he caused the state carriages of the unfortunate Louis XVI., which had lain by in dust and neglect for ten years, to be regilt for his use. In the same spirit, he selected as preacher on the occasion, the Cardinal de Boisgelin, an exemplary prelate, but whom he no doubt selected because he had preached five and twenty years before in the same pulpit at the coronation of Louis XVI. What a deluge had swept over France since that day! But who shall say that in matters such as this, a man so keen-sighted, did not rightly estimate the effect to be produced upon the minds of the people whom he so thoroughly understood?

In the negotiations which went on while the publication of the Concordat was delayed, as well as in those which followed, it was the misfortune of the Holy See that the Legate at Paris, though by no means a hypocrite or indifferent to duty, was yet not to be trusted. This was Cardinal Caprara, a man of illustrious birth, and who had already been employed in high positions. Napoleon insisted on his being appointed to the office, practically refusing to receive any one else. Although he was not the man whom Pius VII. would have selected, no definite cause could be alleged for refusing him, and he was appointed. He retained the office until, after the extreme outrages of the Emperor upon the Holy See, the Pope recalled his powers, and appointed no successor. In that time it is not too much to say that, although there is no reason to suppose he intended to betray the cause of the Church, yet he conducted himself on numerous occasions rather as the minister of the Emperor than of the Pope. More than once he acted in direct disobedience to the positive commands and instructions of the Holy See, and at last so entirely lost the confidence of the Holy Father, that, instead of instructing him to say what he had too good reason to

believe would not be said, he used to send letters written in full, which his nuncio was only to sign and deliver. M. D'Haussonville finds that Caprara, on several occasions, allowed himself to be under pecuniary obligations to Napoleon.

The next affair of importance between Napoleon and the Holy Father was the coronation in Nôtre Dame. M. D'Haussonville tells excellently all the circumstances which led to this event—the Emperor's notion of the extreme importance of the religious sanction it would give his title, especially as tending to remove the ill-effects of the recent murder of the Duke d'Enghien; the consternation of Cardinal Caprara when first sounded upon it by Napoleon; his pressing importunities to the Holy Father not to refuse; the promises so made as to give the Pope to understand more than Napoleon had any intention of fulfilling; the Pope's enthusiastic reception by the French people, and the jealousy which it excited in the mind of Napoleon.

For all this, and much more, we must refer our readers to his pages. It is, however, important to notice that Napoleon's uncle, Cardinal Fesch, earnestly pressed Pius VII. to make the restitution of the Legations (still held by the French) and a compensation for Avignon and Carpentras a condition of his consent, and that the Pope (although hoping this from the Emperor's generosity) steadily refused to mix the temporal question with the spiritual points upon which he felt bound in conscience to insist. One of these was the form of the coronation oath which the Pope was to tender to the Emperor. As drawn up by the Emperor, it bound him to "respect and make others respect the laws of the Concordat." This the Pope refused, because it might be taken to include the "organic articles," which, though not really part of the Concordat, had been published as such by Napoleon. A still more important question arose upon the words "to respect and cause to be respected the liberty of worships [*la liberté des cultes*]. To this Cardinal Consalvi, in the name of the Pope, objected: "This implies an engagement, not to tolerate and allow, but to support and protect; and it extends, not only to the persons but to the things, that is to all worships [*à tous les cultes*]. But a Catholic cannot protect the error of false worships."\* Caprara replies to this, that the terms of the oath meant nothing. But Consalvi rejoins:—

The formula is such as a Catholic ought not to take, and a Pope cannot

---

\* Vol. i., p. 330.

authorise by his presence. It is of the essence of the Catholic religion to be intolerant. No one must be quieted with any hope that this difficulty about the oath in the Pope's presence may be evaded (*l'espoir de tourner cette difficulté*). Pius VII. will not be a party to it. He has declared to Cardinal Fesch that, if the attempt is made, he will not hesitate to rise from his seat the same instant, let what may come of it (Vol. i., p. 334).

One curious fact, the explanation of which has been hitherto unknown, and has been discovered by our author, is that while the newspapers of all Europe were filled with circumstantial descriptions of this remarkable scene, the *Moniteur* alone—so minute as to all that magnified the Emperor—gave no account of it. This was because Napoleon's act in putting the Imperial crown upon his own head instead of receiving it from the Holy Father, was a breach of an engagement expressly made upon this very point. Consalvi had pointed out that in every instance the Monarch had received the crown from the Prelate, from whom he received the anointing, and made it a condition of the Holy Father's coming that this custom should be observed. With his usual perfidy the Emperor gave and broke the promise. Pius declared that if any authorized report was published which showed that things had not been done as had been arranged beforehand, he would make a public protest stating the breach of engagement. To avoid this the *Moniteur* suppressed all report of the proceedings. Every act of Napoleon's life seems full of the same strange mixture of dignity and meanness.

Pius VII. returned to Rome—the fact is remarkable—so much fascinated by that wonderful power which Napoleon acquired over all who personally approached him, that no future events, no lapse of time, no outrages, no crimes, were ever able to destroy the affection with which the Holy Father regarded him. From that day began the series of those outrages and crimes which culminated in the prison at Savona, and the scenes at Fontainebleau. Every condition upon which he had insisted, every hope which had been held out to him, had been violated; but even to the last Pius seems to have found a difficulty in forcing himself to believe that Napoleon himself could be personally guilty of the perfidy and impiety which marked his public measures. Almost as soon as he had reached Rome, a question arose, in consequence of Napoleon's introducing into his Italian kingdom, in which the whole people were Catholics, the rules adopted in France. While Consalvi wrote in strong terms to the Legate, Pius VII. wrote (we may say affectionately) to Napoleon. He received an answer, accompanied by one to the French Minister of Rome (Cardinal Fesch), in



which he was directed to arrange with the Holy See modifications of the decree.\* To this he replied :—

The proofs which your Majesty gives me of your attachment to religion and your opposition to the false spirit of philosophy of the age, have filled me with consolation. Everything which comes directly from your Majesty always shows the greatness and uprightness of your character. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the feelings to which you may be fully assured that my own most fully and most sincerely answer. Be equally convinced that, so far as I am concerned, I am guided by no policy. My only guides are the maxims of the Gospel and the laws of the Church. You may, therefore, be sure beforehand that I shall always proceed in perfect simplicity of heart, and with all possible spirit of conciliation and moderation.— (Vol. ii., p. 22.)

Well would it have been for Napoleon if he could have believed what the Holy Father here said in simple sincerity of heart, as to the motives of his own conduct; it would have saved him from his greatest and most fatal mistakes as well as crimes. But, as we have already said, this was exactly what the moral defect of his own character made impossible to him. That men should profess sentiments of exalted generosity, of noble self-sacrifice, of simple devotion to the cause of duty; this seemed to him perfectly natural. He felt, as strongly as any one else, that there are occasions on which such professions are highly becoming, just as it was fit that, on the day of his coronation, he should dress himself in sweeping robes of the richest crimson velvet spangled with golden bees. Such things were excellent in their place, and so were professions of high principle. In their place he used them himself, and approved of their use by others. What he could not imagine, what he never brought himself to believe was—that any man should really be guided by such principles in the practical business of life. As soon would he have thought of riding into a fierce and bloody battle in his coronation robes. And hence, he never really understood the conduct of the Holy See. Being sure that the reasons alleged for it could not possibly be true, he had to look about for others, and fixed upon some, not in themselves unlikely or irrational, but which quite misled him, because the real reason was that which he had begun by setting aside, without examination, as simply impossible. The first instance of this immediately followed. Jerome Bonaparte had married a Protestant lady in the United States. It was manifestly convenient that the marriage should be dissolved that he might take a wife

---

\* The author adds, these modifications were never really made.

from one of the royal families of Catholic Germany. At once, and without doubt of a favourable result, the Emperor applied to the Pope. He felt sure that Pius could feel no objection, for it was evidently for the interest of the Church that the Emperor should be surrounded with Catholics rather than Protestants. The Holy Father replied, by a letter in his own hand, assuring him of his wish to declare the marriage null if he could, and explaining why, on the evidence as yet before him, he could not do so without violating the laws of God and the Church. He concluded :—

It is therefore out of my power in the present state of things to pronounce the marriage null. If I should usurp a power which I have not, I should render myself guilty of an abuse abominable before the judgment-seat of God ; and your Majesty yourself, in your justice, would blame me for pronouncing a sentence opposite to the testimony of my conscience and to the invariable principles of the Church. Hence I confidently hope that your Majesty will feel certain that it is only by an absolute want of power that the desire I have always felt to second, as far as lies in me, all your designs, and particularly in a matter which so closely touches your august person, has in this instance been made inefficacious. And I entreat you to accept this sincere declaration as an evidence of my truly fatherly affection.

Every Catholic who has paid any attention to the subject well knows that the facts set forth by Pius VII. in this letter, and not disputed on the other side, made it, not merely inexpedient or unbecoming, but simply impossible, that he should, without monstrous wickedness, declare Jerome's marriage null and void.\* His reply was merely an example of the *Non possumus*. This letter put Napoleon beside himself with rage. The Pope refuse to take, at his request, a step so obviously expedient and beneficial for all parties ! What could be his motive ? That which he alleged, of course, could have nothing to do with it. What had conscience and the "judgment-seat of God" to do with a practical matter such as this ? Very good things, no doubt, to talk about on fitting occasions, but quite out of place now. The refusal, therefore,

---

\* Prince Jerome Napoleon thought fit to publish in the *Revue des deux Mondes* a letter maintaining the view taken of this affair by Napoleon I., and going on to say that at a later period of his life Pius VII. himself, "whatever may have been the motives of his first resistance, did not persist in it." The proofs he gives of this are simply absurd. We direct the attention of our readers to the correspondence which they will find vol. ii., p. 409, *pièces Justificatives*, because it contains in M. D'Haussonville's answer to the Prince some exquisite specimens, peculiarly French, of keen "*malice*" under the forms of profound reverence, which will greatly amuse them, but which we have no room to extract.

must have been given to spite him ; and he had not far to go to find the motive. He knew that he had both robbed and cheated the Pope by keeping the "Legations." No doubt this refusal was the Pope's way of showing his anger at the wrong and the insult. Of course, taking this view of the matter, he was sure that he could easily overcome the resistance of so feeble an enemy by making him feel that, however reasonable his indignation might be, he would lose much more than he could possibly gain by indulging it.

From this point, then, began the contest between Napoleon and Pius VII. Almost at the same moment the policy of Napoleon took a turn which made him feel it important to have the practical control, not merely of the Legations (of which he still kept possession), but of the whole States of the Church. A few months before, his whole heart had been fixed upon the invasion of England (and he never varied from his policy of keeping, at all costs, on friendly terms with other powers while he was attacking any one) ; he therefore intended to keep things quiet on the Continent. The failure of his plan of invasion in the summer of 1805 determined him to attack Austria. In that war it was of great importance not to leave behind him any country in which England might raise the standard of opposition to him, and such a country he believed the States of the Church to be. True, the Sovereign Pontiff professed absolute neutrality ; but he had already shown—so judged Napoleon—by the affair of the divorce that he hated Napoleon, and would do him an injury if he could ; the Emperor therefore resolved to occupy Ancona, a harbour which in a war with Austria it would not do to leave in hostile hands. To a mild letter of remonstrance from the Holy Father he replied (waiting until after the stupendous victory of Austerlitz) by letters of studied insult addressed both to himself and to the French Minister at Rome (Cardinal Fesch). To the latter, after referring again to the affair of the divorce, he declared—

To the Pope I am Charlemagne ; because, like Charlemagne, I unite the crown of France to that of the Lombards, and because my empire extends to the boundaries of the East. I expect, therefore, that his conduct towards me should be regulated upon this principle. If good conduct is maintained, I shall not change the outward appearance of things ; if not, I shall reduce the Pope to be only Bishop of Rome. In truth, nothing can be so unreasonable as the Court of Rome (Vol. ii., p. 78).

Here, probably, Napoleon first gave an indication of the principle upon which he intended to act towards the temporal dominions of the Pope. A little later he expressed it more

and more plainly. In few words it was, that the Pope should nominally remain an independent Sovereign, both in war and peace, on condition of his becoming, in fact, a feudatory of the French Emperor. It is probable that his natural disposition would have led him to say nothing about these intentions, but silently to assume in detail the control of Rome, and to let the fact that he had become Sovereign of the Roman States break by degrees upon the minds both of the Pope and his subjects. But it was not open to him to adopt this plan, because it was necessary to his other plans to assume immediate authority. He was at war with England and Russia. It was convenient that the States of the Church should take his side in the war; he resolved, therefore, as he said in the letter we have just quoted, that there must be no delay, that the Pope must either at once join in the war, or be at once deprived of his territory. Six weeks later, February 22nd, 1806, he explained this, in plain words, to the Holy Father himself.

I share all your Holiness's distress, and can imagine your perplexity. You may avoid it all by going straight forward, and not entering into a political labyrinth, and into considerations for powers which, in a religious point of view, are heretical and out of the Church, and, in a political, are far removed from your States, unable either to protect or injure you. I shall not touch the independence of the Holy See. I shall even cause it to be repaid for whatever it may lose by the movements of my army. But the condition must be, that your Holiness must be to me, in matters temporal (*aura pour moi dans le temporal, les mêmes égards que je lui porte pour le spirituel*), what I am to you in matters spiritual; that you must cease to have any useless consideration for heretics, enemies of the Church, and for powers which are unable to do you any good. Your Holiness is Sovereign of Rome; *but I am its Emperor. All my enemies must be yours.* It is not fit that any agent of the King of Sardinia, any Englishman, Russian, or Swede, should reside at Rome, or in your States, or that any vessel of those powers should enter your ports (Vol. ii., p. 101).

The author remarks, "It was the Emperor's ordinary calculation, and ever afterwards his habit, when he wished to make a strong impression on any one, to assume towards him an attitude of complaint and a tone of profound irritation." The letter before us is an example of this, but we have not room for half of it. But he wrote the same day to his Minister at Rome—

You must demand the expulsion from the States of the Pope of all English, Russians, and Swedes, and all persons attached to the Court of the King of Sardinia. No vessel either Swedish, English, or Russian, must be allowed to enter the States of the Pope, or else I will confiscate them. I

do not intend the Court of Rome in future to take any part in politics. I will protect its States against all the world. It is useless that it should have so much consideration for the enemies of religion. Say that I am Charlemagne, the sword of the Church, their Emperor, and that I must be treated as such. I am making known my intentions to the Pope in a few words. If he does not keep to them, I shall reduce him to the same condition he was in before Charlemagne (Vol. ii., p. 105).

We grudge to the letters of Napoleon the space we are compelled to give them, because without having them before their eyes our readers could not realize to themselves the position of the Holy Father. Before answering these last letters, he called together the Sacred College, and asked the opinion of its members one by one, reserving his own till the last. The opinion was unanimous, with the single exception of one French Cardinal. The answer was then written.

March 21, 1806.

I owe it to God, to the Church, and to myself, to the attachment I profess towards your Majesty, to your own glory, which I have as much at heart as yourself, to speak freely and sincerely, as becomes the uprightness of my character and the duty of my ministry. I have had, and always shall have, the greatest consideration for your Majesty; but still I can neither lend myself to anything absolutely contrary to the obligations which inevitably result from my double character of Prince and Pontiff, nor hide the truths of which I am in my conscience intimately convinced, nor accede to demands directly inconsistent with the oath I have taken, before the face of the Almighty, and at His altar, to maintain untouched from age to age the charge of the patrimony of the Roman Church. . . . Your Majesty desires that I should expel from my States all Russians, English, and Swedes, and all the agents of the King of Sardinia; and that I should close my ports against the vessels of those three nations. That is to say, you demand that I, renouncing the peace I enjoy, should place myself, with regard to those powers, in a state of war and open hostility. Permit me to say, with perfect sincerity, that it is not with a view to my temporal interests, but by reason of duties most essential and inseparable from my character, that I find it impossible to accede to this demand. I, the Vicar of the Eternal Word, who is not the God of discord, but of concord and peace, who, according to the expression of the Apostle, came into the world to put an end to the enmities of the world, how could I possibly discard the precept of my Divine Master, and place myself in opposition to the mission to which He has called me? It is not my will but the will of God that lays down the duty of peace towards all, without distinction of Catholic or heretic, of those near or remote, of those from whom we can hope benefits or fear great evils. If, as your Majesty says, I ought not "to enter into the labyrinth of politics," from which, in fact, I have held, and shall always hold, myself aloof, how much more ought I to abstain from taking part in the evils of a war which has no cause except politics, in which no attack is made upon religion, and

in which there is even involved a Catholic power ! Nothing but the necessity of repelling a hostile aggression, or defending religion from peril, has afforded to my predecessors a legitimate motive for giving up the condition of peace. If, through human frailty, any one of them has not been subject to these maxims, his conduct, I declare openly, can never serve as an example to mine.

Then Pius VII. explained with the same gentleness and the same sound reason that to expel from his states the subjects of heretical Powers, who were at war with the Emperor, and to shut his ports against them, would be to provoke an inevitable interruption of the daily communications which existed between the Holy See and the Catholics who lived under the rule of these courts.

The irresistible force of human events has sometimes led to this fatal interruption of communication between the head of the Church and some of its most faithful members. The Church has then deeply grieved at the calamity. But if she became the cause herself, what would be the bitterness of her remorse, and how could she smother the inward voice of conscience which would eternally reproach her with so unpardonable a fault. The Catholics who live in heretical countries are, moreover, no small number. Can I abandon so many faithful souls, when I am required by the Gospel to do everything in order to seek one ? There are millions in the Russian empire ; there are millions upon millions in the regions subject to England. They enjoy the free exercise of their religion ; they are protected. What a responsibility to have led to the prohibition of religion in these lands, the ruin of holy missions, the stagnation of spiritual affairs ! An incalculable evil for religion and for Catholicism ; an evil for which I should have to accuse myself, and for which I should have to give a strict account before the judgment-seat of God ! (Vol. ii., p. 141).

The Emperor had complained of many serious evils resulting from dilatory proceedings at Rome. The Pope replies—

Your Majesty would have spared me the pain of your blame if you had considered that such affairs absolutely require mature counsel, and that it is impossible in discussing them to be as rapid as in temporal matters. This accusation your Majesty particularises by applying it to the ecclesiastical affairs of Germany. You say that for the sake of worldly interests, and the vain prerogatives of the tiara, souls are left to perish. I receive as from the hand of the Most High the humiliating bitterness of the reproach which your Majesty has thought fit to make to me. God and the world are my witnesses whether or not my conduct has been guided by worldly interests and vain prerogatives.

The Pope then explained that the ecclesiastical arrangements of Germany had been complicated, and their settlement delayed by the territorial changes which had resulted from Napoleon's wars. He continued—



Your Majesty lays down the principle that you are Emperor of Rome. I reply, with apostolic frankness, that the Pope, who became Sovereign of Rome so many centuries ago that no other sovereignty on earth can go back to a more remote point in history, does not acknowledge, and never has acknowledged, any power superior to himself in his own dominions. I will add that no Emperor has ever had the least right over Rome. Your Majesty is immensely great; you have been elected, crowned, consecrated, acknowledged, Emperor of the French, but not Emperor of Rome. There exists no Emperor of Rome; there can exist none unless the Sovereign Pontiff shall have been despoiled of the sovereign authority he exercises at Rome. We well know that there exists an Emperor of the Romans; but this is a title elective and merely honorary, acknowledged by all Europe, and by your Majesty yourself, as belonging to the Emperor of Germany, and cannot be borne by two Sovereigns at the same time. Your Majesty tells me that my relations towards yourself ought to be those which existed between my predecessors and Charlemagne. Charlemagne found Rome in the hands of the Popes. He acknowledged and confirmed without reserve their dominion, and augmented it by new donations; but never did he claim to exercise any supremacy over the Popes, even considered as mere temporal Princes. Never did he require from them any dependence or any subjection of any kind. . . . Finally, ten centuries have passed since the time of Charlemagne, which renders it useless to go back to a more ancient origin. I am compelled to point out to your Majesty that the principles you have advanced cannot be sustained. Still less is it possible that I should accept the consequences which you would draw from them. . . . I cannot admit the maxim by which your Majesty lays down that I ought to be towards you in matters temporal as your Majesty towards me in matters spiritual. The extent given to this proposition entirely alters the character and destroys the very essence of these two powers. Spiritual things, in fact, do not admit of simple relations [*simples égards*]; they come from [*relevent de*] a divine right. Their essence is superior and transcendent, and does not admit of any comparison with temporal objects. A Catholic Sovereign is such, solely because he professes to conform himself to the decisions of the visible head of the Church, and to acknowledge him as the master of truth [*maître de la vérité*] and sole Vicar of God upon earth. There can, therefore, be no identity, no equality between the spiritual relation of a Catholic Sovereign to the Chief of the Hierarchy, and the relations of one temporal Sovereign to another. . . . The second consequence which your Majesty desires to draw from these principles is to establish the point that your enemies must of necessity become my enemies also. This doctrine is absolutely contrary to the character of my divine mission, which knows no enmity even towards those who are unhappily separated from the centre of unity; and we could not subscribe to it without breaking the bond of common paternity which exists between the Sovereign Pontiffs and all Sovereigns who are within the bosom of the Church. For, according to your Majesty's very proposition, every time a Catholic power was at war, it would be my duty to treat it as an enemy (Vol. ii., p. 146).

Pius VII. then pointed out that Napoleon, who prided him-

self upon being "the avenger and defender of the Church," would be inconsistent with himself if he demanded the adoption of principles "through which my temporal independence so advantageous to my spiritual mission would in the end be entirely destroyed."

Among so many trials I have no support except the uprightness of my intentions, the confidence inspired into me by the justice of my cause, and, above all, the hope that your Majesty's filial affection will respond to my overflowing fatherly tenderness ; but if I am disappointed, if the heart of your Majesty is not touched by my words, I shall suffer whatever may come with evangelical resignation. I shall submit to every kind of calamity, and accept it as coming from God ; I shall encounter all the adversities of this life rather than make myself unworthy of my ministry by deviating from the line laid down by my conscience. . . . In conclusion, I will believe that you will not wholly forget that, at this moment, when I am at Rome a prey to so many and such terrible troubles, not one year has passed since I quitted Paris. . . . I give you with my whole heart my fatherly benediction (Vol. ii., p. 148).

We cannot but feel how much the force of this letter is weakened and lost by the fact that our readers cannot possibly have before their minds a just sense of what Napoleon really was when it was written. Never before had the power of a man been so widely extended and so absolute ; for none even of the heathen Emperors of Rome, whose dominions were more extended, at any time held the actual strings by which all the resources and powers of the empire were set in motion so absolutely in his own hands. What is chiefly impressed upon us in reading the volumes of M. D'Haussonville (especially in connection with those of M. Thiers) is, that for many years no one, either within or without his dominions, had presumed to resist the will of Napoleon or to give a direct refusal even to his most unjust and most unreasonable demands. At Paris, the ambassadors of the most ancient, most powerful, and proudest royal and imperial houses of Europe trembled before him. When he took the field it was only because the most abject submission could not suffice to avert his dreadful wrath from those whom he thought it his interest to crush. He was wont to look around him upon the great powers of the Continent and consider, not which of them he could subdue, for he was confident that none could resist him, but which he should for the present spare. A little later he balanced in his own mind, in the same spirit, from which of those houses he should accept a successor to the divorced Josephine. In truth, for years past no one within the European Continent had ever presumed to oppose him. England, no doubt, was still out of

his reach, but he doubted not that if only he could get within arm's length of her he could break her in pieces, and meanwhile he boasted that he had shut her out of the world by his continental blockade. But that he should be defied, not in the frenzy of despair, but soberly and calmly, by an unarmed old man; that his orders should be not only disobeyed, but argued against and showed to be unreasonable,—it was beyond belief, beyond imagination. The letter of which we have given such copious extracts “filled him,” says our author, “not with rage only but with indignation.” And now began the death-struggle between the all-powerful Emperor and the unresisting Pontiff. His anger was increased by Cardinal Fesch, whose conscience would not allow him to go wholly against the Pope (a little later he refused to accept the Archbishopric of Paris when urged by the Emperor to take it without the authority of the Holy Father), but who hated Cardinal Consalvi to such a degree of madness as even to accuse him of having instigated a murder which had been committed at Rome, in order to throw the odium of it on the French. At last Consalvi had been compelled to resign. Fesch himself was recalled because work was to be done upon which Napoleon did not choose to employ his uncle. M. Alquier, his successor, warned the Emperor in very striking language (vol. ii., p. 303) that in matters which touched his conscience Pius was not influenced or controlled by any adviser, but took his own course. If Napoleon believed him, which may be doubted, he perhaps felt it too late to retreat now. Our space will not allow us to follow the different measures of aggression by which Napoleon laid his hands inch by inch upon the dominions of the Holy Father. It was highly characteristic that the execution of the final outrages, even when fully determined, was long delayed, and things remained as they were, because Napoleon was engaged in the difficult and somewhat alarming campaign which ended in the battle of Jena, and while he had before him the task of breaking the power of Prussia, he would not subject himself to any increase of his enemies by a new outrage, even on Pius VII. On the 31st of July, 1806, we have another letter of the Pope, addressed nominally to his nuncio at Paris, at that time an open partizan of the Emperor, for Napoleon (on pretexts characteristically false and little) had now refused to communicate with him directly, but evidently intended for the eye of the Emperor. We wish our space allowed us to give the whole of it.

I have earnestly commended myself to that God, of whom I, unworthy as I am, am Vicar on earth, and to S. Peter the Apostle, of whom I am the

successor, to obtain the light of which I have need, in order to give the answer you demand. Here is that answer, written with my own hand, as an additional proof of the importance I attach to matters of such weight, and how sincere and deep are the sentiments by which I am actuated, and which I am obliged to make known to you. My reasons for refusing to make the declaration demanded of me are too strong, too just, too powerful to make possible any change of opinion. They are founded not upon human considerations, as is imagined, but upon the most essential duties imposed upon me both by my character as the common father of the faithful, and by the nature of my ministry of peace. Admit that the English (as His Majesty tells you), will never believe that Rome suffered itself to be destroyed for their sake, and will never be grateful for it, that is not what I have to consider. I have thought only of my own duties, which lay me under the obligation of not causing any injury to religion by the interruption of communications between the head and the members of the Church, in any place where Catholics exist. This interruption I should myself provoke if I were to exercise acts of hostility against any one nation, and make myself a partner in a war against it. If the injuries caused to religion came from the acts of another, like that which may result from the measures which His Majesty may take in consequence of my refusal to agree to his demand, I shall grieve over them in bitterness of heart, and shall adore the judgments of God, who, for the secret designs of His Providence, allows them. But if, betraying my sacred character and the nature of my ministry, I should take part in a war which provoked resentments injurious to the Church, those evils would be my own act ; and this it is that I cannot do. I cannot, in order to avoid the evils with which I am threatened, give occasion by my own fault to those evils to the Church which I have mentioned. Those with which I am threatened are not necessary evils, they depend solely on the will of His Majesty, who is free to make them actual or to avoid them. . . . His Majesty has told you that if Rome and the States of the Church are once in his hands, they will never come out of them. His Majesty may easily believe this, and persuade himself of it, but I reply frankly that if His Majesty has a right to be confident that power is on his side, I, for my part, know that above all monarchs there reigns a God, the avenger of justice and innocence, before whom every human power must bend. You tell me that the Emperor says to you that the affair has now become public, and that therefore he cannot go back. But I must crave His Majesty to consider that he can lose nothing of his greatness and magnanimity, when it is not before an earthly potentate, a rival of his power, that he gives way and bends, but before the representations and entreaties of a priest of Jesus Christ, his father and his friend. If this consideration does not avail to persuade him, I am bound to tell him with apostolic freedom that, if His Majesty is committed in honour before men, I am committed in conscience before God ; that the head of the Church will never take part in war ; that I assuredly will not be first to give to the Church and the world an example which none of my predecessors, during eighteen centuries, has given, that of uniting myself in a state of war progressive, indefinite, permanent, against any nation whatever ; that I cannot accede to the federative system of the French Empire ; that my dominions,

transmitted to me independent of all federation, must remain so by the nature of my apostolical ministry ; and that if this independence is attacked, if the threats which are addressed to me are executed without any regard to my dignity and to the affection which binds me to His Majesty, then I shall see in that the signal of an open persecution, and shall appeal to the judgment of God. My course is irrevocable. Nothing can change it ; neither threats, nor the execution of those threats. . . . These sentiments you may regard as my testament. I am ready, if necessary, to sign it with my blood, fortifying myself, if persecution breaks out, with those words of our Divine Master, "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice sake." Make known these sentiments to His Majesty in their fullest extent ; I expressly command it. But at the same time tell the Emperor that he still has my affection, and that I have every wish to give him every proof of it which is in my power, and to continue to show myself his best friend ; but what is demanded is out of my power to do. (Vol. ii. 320.)

This letter was indeed the Holy Father's last word. It reminds one of those of Moses when he appeared for the last time before Pharaoh, "Thou shalt see my face no more ;" and of those more solemn words of his Lord and Master when, for the last time He left the Temple, "Ye shall see Me no more." It is true that the end was for some months delayed, not by scruples on the part of the Emperor, but by the war with Prussia. And then came the perfidious seizure of the city of Rome itself, of which we have already spoken. At that point our space compels us to close our account of the relations of the Holy Father with Napoleon, although the part of M. D'Haussonville's book already published carried them on for a year later. The seizure of Rome is the most natural conclusion of the first stage of those relations which was ended when Pius VII. was no longer, even nominally, in possession of his dominions. When the work is completed, we hope to return to it.

We must, however, notice that our author thinks the Holy Father was inconsistent, because at the last moment he consented to forbid the entry of English and Russian ships to his ports, after having declared it a point of conscience which he could not yield. It is strange that he does not see that things had then come to a point at which the one cause always assigned by Pius VII. for his refusal no longer applied. The French were in full possession of all his ports, especially Ancona and Civita Vecchia ; the Customs' revenues were appropriated by them ; his soldiers had been incorporated into the French army. It was therefore evident that his conceding this particular point could no longer be regarded by the English government as an act of war, because the French occupation had already excluded English ships. His concession, there-

fore, at that particular moment only confirmed what he had always said, that his refusal of it had been an act of duty, and not a mere point of worldly honour. When the duty no longer forbade, the concession was made. In confirmation of this it is to be observed, that in conceding this one point he still absolutely refused to join in the war or to submit his States to the federal authority of the French empire. The concession, therefore, had no effect, beyond proving the sincerity of the Pope's declaration, that he was anxious to concede all he could concede with a safe conscience.

But in truth the wishes of Napoleon had by this time greatly changed. Time had been when he had meant what he said, that he wished the Pope to continue at Rome a nominal sovereign if only he would exercise his sovereignty in that state of subordination to the French Emperor which he required from his brothers and other subordinate kings. But he wished this no longer. On the contrary, he was now eagerly looking for a pretext for removing him into France and establishing him there, in all splendour and state, as one of the great officers of the new Empire. His plan was to give him a revenue of £120,000 sterling per annum, magnificent palaces, &c.; he even went so far as to name Rheims as the place designed for his residence. This was part of his plan for making the Catholic Church as distinctly a tool in the hands of the French Emperor as the Russian schism actually is in the hands of the autocrat of the Russias. This is not the inference drawn by others as to his desires and wishes,—it was his own deliberate plan, sketched in letters at the time and fully drawn out in a note dictated by himself at St. Helena. It was, of course, inconsistent with the *quasi* independence of the Pope, and therefore it is plain in the latter communications between Rome and Paris that the Emperor's fear was lest the Pope should concede what he demanded. So strong was this fear, that in transmitting an ultimatum of almost inconceivable insolence, he expressly retained the right of adding to it, if accepted, any new demands; that it might be always in his power to force the Pope into a refusal which would give him an excuse for going to extremities.

It is impossible not to feel that, to human appearance, the Catholic Church was in greater danger in January, 1810, than at any former period. She had to face not a barbarian invasion like that of Attila, but a strongly-compacted empire; and what she had to fear from it was not a persecution like that of Nero, which was sure to purify and unite the Church by the same acts which gave to individual confessors a mar-



tyr's tortures and a martyr's crown ; but a deliberate and well-devised system by which she was to be pampered, crippled, and enslaved. Against such a system she had to rely, humanly speaking, on the personal qualities of Pius VII., an old, mild, gentle, unresisting monk. All the world now knows that she prevailed ; but, before the event, all the world believed her success to be hopeless. And, considering that the greatest danger of all was that of an election to the Papacy under the tyranny of Napoleon, it is impossible not to note the remarkable Providence by which the reign of Pius VII., which began at the moment when the victory of Marengo was about to make Napoleon absolute master of Italy, was continued until his empire and himself had passed away. It is with something like anxiety that one reads, even now, of the precautions taken by the tyrant to have the cardinals always absolutely in his power, that he might at any moment be ready to act in case of a vacancy.

What use Napoleon intended to make of the Catholic Church when he held her, as he already securely reckoned upon doing, as a tool in his hands, we may see by his actual conduct towards the clergy of France. These volumes are full of instances of the combination of a grinding tyranny which dictatated the most minute details of the daily ministration, not merely of great prelates but of village curés, with falsehood and fraud so deliberate and so shameless, that even after all we know of Napoleon it is hardly credible.

Perhaps the most curious illustration of his dealings in ecclesiastical matters, hitherto unknown even in France, was the manner in which he contrived to impose a new catechism upon all the dioceses of France. All the world knows that it was professedly authorized by the Pope. It has been made a ground of complaint against Pius VII. (and apparently not without reason), that he should have deprived the Bishops of their discretion in this matter, for the benefit, not of the Church, but of the Emperor. It has now been shown that, in truth, he did exactly the reverse. All that passed is most graphically related by M. D'Haussonville. In the concordat as published by Napoleon it is declared, "There shall be only one liturgy and one catechism for all the churches of France." This, however, was one of his perfidious additions to the real Concordat. Our author skilfully brings in, into the midst of his account of Napoleon's strange interference about the catechism, extracts from two letters written just at the same time, which show how little he really cared about doctrine. He wrote to his sister Eliza, his Satrap at Lucca—

“My sister, require no oath of the priests. Nothing will come of that except new difficulties. Go straight on to suppress the convents.”

A few days later he wrote :—

“The Pope’s brief is nothing as long as it remains secret in your hands. Lose not an hour—not a minute—in annexing the property of the convents to the State. Do not trouble yourself about any dogma. Lay hands on the property of the monks, that is the really important matter, and let everything else take its chance.” (Vol. ii., 254.)

It is curious to find the same man at the same moment so anxious about the exact doctrinal teaching of the children in every French parish. The Nuncio at Paris, Cardinal Caprara, a tool in his hands, wrote a letter, intended to draw a permission from Rome, for the use of a single catechism in all the parishes of France. Consalvi, “with his usual acuteness,” suspected something behind, and answered :—

“The Holy See has always desired, aimed at uniformity in the manner of teaching and learning Christian doctrine. For this end, Pius V., after the decree of the Council of Trent, ordered that the Roman catechism for parish priests should be published, and Clement VII. that of Bellarmine for children. Yet their liberty of choice has never been taken from the bishops, and especially from those beyond the Alps, except so far as is defined by Benedict XIV., in the constitution *Etsi Minimum*, Chap. xvii. Therefore the Holy Father, following the example of his predecessors, will not interfere with the French bishops in their choice of the catechism which each of them may judge most suitable to the special circumstances of his own flock, provided that the wise directions of Benedict XIV. are observed. . . . Should the Government wish to give the preference to any one catechism, or perhaps to make a new one, and impose it by authority upon the use of the bishops, His Holiness would be unable not to regard that act as an insult to the whole body of the Episcopate. His Holiness would have it observed that the Divine Legislator has given the right of teaching only to his Apostles, and to the bishops, their successors, and *not to any others*. . . . It does not belong therefore to the secular power to choose or to prescribe to the bishops the catechism which it prefers. This belongs only to the judgment of the Church. . . . Should it come to your knowledge that any one has a plan for taking an advantage of the religion of the Emperor, and obtaining from him the authorisation and promulgation of a catechism of this sort, your Eminence will not hesitate to warn His Majesty upon the subject, and to say to him, in the name of His Holiness, to be on his guard against the authors of such counsels, and that the Holy Father is persuaded that matters of doctrine certainly His Imperial Majesty has no thought of arrogating to himself a power which God has confided exclusively to the Church

and to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. . . . The Holy Father would feel the greatest repugnance to prescribe to the bishops of a whole nation the use of the same catechism in such a manner that the prelates could not vary from it according to the wants of their respective dioceses." (Vol. ii., 280.)

It is a remarkable proof of Consalvi's foresight that he should have suspected a trap so skilfully prepared for him. Never, probably, did he suspect what really happened. Caprara suppressed the letters, and falsely declared that "he had authority to approve the new catechism; and some days later (February 30, 1806) formally approved it in the name and by the authority of the Pope." Next appeared an official notice that a catechism "uniform and obligatory upon all the dioceses of France was about to be published immediately with the official approbation of the Cardinal Legate." When this *Moniteur* reached Rome, Consalvi wrote in the name of the Pope a second letter, expressing his doubts whether the announcement could be correct; but strictly requiring Caprara to take no step in the matter without referring it to Rome. This letter also Caprara suppressed, and it cannot be imagined that the Emperor did not well know all about these letters, but Caprara took care that he should have no official knowledge of them.

It soon appeared why so much trouble had been taken. The new catechism professed to be that of Bossuet, whose name suffices to throw any Frenchman into an ecstasy of admiration which deprives him of the use of his intellect. In the main it was so; but, in explaining the fourth commandment of God, Bossuet had taught that it requires us "to respect all superiors, pastors, kings, magistrates, and others."

"The Prince himself," says our author, who was none other than Louis XIV., "was familiarly mixed up with the crowd of 'superiors.' What was enough for Louis was far from satisfying to Napoleon. M. D'Haussonville shows that this part of the catechism was drawn up by himself and his minister. The duties of his subjects towards Napoleon fill three lessons. Napoleon at first wrote, "Is submission to the government of France a dogma of the Church?" The answer was his own writing—"Yes, Scripture teaches that he who resists the Powers resists the order of God. Yes; the Church imposes upon us the most special duties towards the Government of France, the protection of religion and of the Church. She requires us to love and cherish it, and to be ready to make any sacrifice in its service." This was modified

at the suit of the theologians at Paris.\* But as the catechism finally stood it declares—

“Christians owe to the princes by whom they are governed, and in particular we owe to Napoleon I., our Emperor, love, reverence, obedience, fidelity, military service, tributes, &c. &c.”

It then gives the special claim of Napoleon I., as

“raised up by God under circumstances of difficulty to re-establish public worship, and the religion of our fathers, and to be its Protector. By his profound and active wisdom he has restored and preserved public order. By his mighty arm he defends the State. By the consecration he has received from the Sovereign Pontiff, the Head of the Universal Church, he has become the Lord’s anointed. Q. What must we think of those who fail in their duty towards our Emperor? A. According to the Apostle St. Paul, they resist the order established by God Himself, and make themselves worthy of eternal damnation.”

There is a good deal more, but this is enough. One other thing Napoleon wanted to alter in Bossuet’s catechism—the declaration, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. This, however, our author says he gave up when it was pointed out to him that he had insisted on pronouncing eternal damnation against all who opposed his government, or who even had not sufficient love towards him. This argument *ad hominem*, says our author prevailed, “especially as it was only a question of pronouncing the damnation of some souls.” The fact is that Napoleon was enamoured of that style of argument. He was fond of calling together the clergy of a district and giving them a charge in a style of his own. To such an assembly at Breda (March 6, 1810) he delivered a long sermon, ending, “if you persist in your maxims, you will be wretched here below, and damned in the other world.” It was well that the latter part of the sentence was less in his power than the former. To the clergy of the Department of the Dyle he declared, “I won’t have either the religion or the notions of the Gregory VII.s, the Bonifaces, the Juliuses, who wished to subject kingdoms and kings to their power, and excommunicated emperors to disturb the tranquillity of peoples. I believe, let people say what they may, that they are burning in hell for the disturbance they stirred up by their extravagant pretensions.”

---

\* We must refer to our author for the circumstances which made it impossible for the Pope formally to denounce this catechism and expose the perfidy by which the sanction of it was obtained.

The mainspring of his government in matters ecclesiastical was perpetual imprisonment authorised by his simple *fiat* communicated in a letter to his Minister of Police. How many hundreds of country priests were left thus to die by inches in state prisons for years together, merely because some one had complained to the Emperor of a sermon delivered on some occasion, we have no means of estimating. The number must have been very large. Lord Shaftesbury's mouth must water when he thinks how the Ritualists would have fared under the great Emperor. First, he would have a check upon all appointments. To effect this he required that for all the high clerical offices a degree in the imperial university should be a *sine quâ non*, and this, as he writes to his Minister of Religion, "can be refused in the case of any man known to entertain notions ultramontane or dangerous to authority."\* He writes to the same Minister to dictate subjects for Episcopal pastorals. It may suggest something to us to find him specially mentioning the wrongs of Ireland as a subject to be insisted upon. But he condescended lower than this. On one occasion, when no one as yet suspected that he was thinking of the divorce of Josephine, he was the guest of the Archbishop of Bordeaux. He was in high good humour and most munificent; even condescending to reprove the Archbishop for not allowing himself greater personal comforts. But the Grand Vicar and a chanoine ventured to state, in answer to some remark of the Emperor, the doctrine of the Church about divorce and the indissolubility of marriage. He was enraged, and had no sooner returned to Paris than he wrote to require the Archbishop to deprive them of their offices. To his Minister he wrote:—

"Make known my displeasure to M. Robert, priest at Bourges. He preached a very bad sermon on the 15th of August." Sometimes he addressed his Minister of the Interior, to require him to set right ecclesiastics who, in his opinion, erred from their duty. More commonly, however, the orders were given to his Commandant of Gendarmerie, or by preference to his Minister of Police, the Duke of Otranto (Fouché), whom he charges to watch attentively the manner in which the members of the French clergy conducted themselves. "The Abbé de Courcy," he writes to M. Lacépède, "does me great mischief. He is always corresponding with his parishioners [*à ses diocésains*]. I desire that that man be arrested and confined in a convent." But before long convents did not seem to him a place of retreat sufficiently secure. Some days later Napoleon, this time addressing Fouché, wrote, "It is important that you keep your eyes open upon the diocese of Poitiers. It is really shameful that you have not yet had the Abbé Stewens

---

\* Vol. ii., p. 243.

arrested. They are asleep, for how else could a wretched priest have escaped" (June 30th, 1805). His Minister of Police had generally a more lucky hand, and then his master addressed compliments to him, even from the heart of Poland. "I see by your letter of the 12th that you have arrested a curé of la Vendée. You have done quite right. Keep him in prison." It is needless to say that these arrests were not preceded by any investigation or followed by any trial. In proportion to the difficulty of the relations to the Holy See their number became more considerable, and thus little by little, in France as in Italy, the prisons were peopled by a multitude of obscure priests. They were committed sometimes to the dungeon of Vincennes, sometimes to the Isles of Sainte Marguerite, to Fenestrella, to Ivrée, and to all the places of confinement set apart for political offenders. In many cases there was nothing alleged against them except suspected opinions on matters of religious discipline, some thoughtless act (*propos* ?) or insignificant fault into which they had been imprudently led by an excess of Ultramontane zeal. Once imprisoned, these unfortunates became dangerous to release, for they would have been applauded and made much of as martyrs by the enthusiastic partizans of the Holy Father, who himself was confined as a prisoner at Savona. In prison, therefore, they were kept indefinitely. Of these poor priests, whose plebeian names have never figured in any history, every one either perished in the dungeons which the Emperor had assigned to them (if they were old men) or else never left them till after his fall. Many of them never had any means of guessing the particular reasons which led to their arrest (Vol. ii. p. 246).

We regret that our space forbids us to call attention to many details of extreme interest, especially with regard to the relations of the Emperor to the French clergy and laity.

---

NOTE.—We have been disappointed at not finding such clear information as we desired as to the grounds of the sentence of nullity passed upon the marriage of Josephine. The author says there are documents on this subject to which he has been refused access. They seem, although in this we may be mistaken, to have been made accessible to M. Thiers. One important fact he was the first to establish, viz., that a religious marriage between Napoleon and Josephine was celebrated by Cardinal Fesch the night before the Coronation at Notre Dame. The question is whether there were any real grounds for pronouncing that marriage null. The great fact to prove that there must have been such grounds is that M. Emery, a man far above suspicion, delivered his opinion against the validity of the marriage. His reasons he did not state. The author says that Napoleon was so inconceivably shameless as to desire that the sentence of nullity should be grounded upon his having withholden his consent. It is difficult to suppose that other grounds would not be found were all the documents accessible. They may have been connected with a subject at which the author only hints in reference to the marriage of Louis Bonaparte with Hortense Beauharnais, and with the anger of Louis when it was proposed that the eldest son of that marriage should be declared presumptive heir to the Emperor, which he refused to sanction, as it would give colour to reports already existing as to the birth of that child (Vol. p. 293).



## ART. VI.—CHURCH MUSIC AND CHURCH CHOIRS.

*Liturgical Rules for Organists, Singers, and Composers.* A Manual compiled from Rubrical and authentic sources ; with Imprimatur of the Archbishop of Westminster. London : Burns, Oates, & Co. 1868.

*Publications on Church Music.* By CANON OAKELEY and Rev. JAMES NARY. 1868.

OUR last number contained the first portion of a paper in which we proposed to lay before our readers a compendious as well as practical view of the subject of Church Music and Church Choirs, with reference more especially to the present circumstances of the Catholic Church in our own country. Our object was to bring to a point some of the more important questions relating to the choral services of the Church, and, if possible, to find a common ground on which the divergent opinions of thoughtful writers amongst us might be reconciled. We should not have ventured upon an undertaking, confessedly so difficult, but for the appearance of the Manual of “*Liturgical Rules*,” recently issued with the approbation of our own diocesan, which seemed to us to indicate, in no doubtful manner, that common ground which was required for the object in view.

In what has been already written we have briefly discussed the first part of our subject, viz., the various kinds of music proper to be used in Catholic worship ; and we have based our conclusions upon the “*Instructions*” to composers of music and to singers, promulgated by the Holy See, and contained in the Manual just alluded to. These instructions, as we have seen, refer to points which apply not only to one locality but to all parts of the Church and to all countries, and are found, moreover, to be in accordance with everything that has been said on the subject by the Supreme Pontiffs from the Council of Trent downwards ; not to speak of the voice of the great body of the Episcopate, whenever it has spoken, and the exhortations of canonized saints and holy men in all ages.

After speaking of the Church Chant, we traced briefly the progress of musical art in connection with the services of religion, and described the various styles which have successively flourished, ending with the school of Beethoven as representing the latest style of sacred composition. With this style (which in all important respects is also that of

Mendelssohn and other recent writers) it was implied that all future composers must start ; in other words, that to be artists for our own day we must take up art where it is, not where it was at some given time in the past ; and that, though we retain for use that which is really artistic in previous schools, yet we do not think of going back to them for our models of composition. On the other hand, it was equally implied that musicians of the present day are not to be absolutely tied to what they find already existing, any more than the composers of former days were bound to follow slavishly in the groove of those by whom they had been preceded. Still less are they to copy particular fashions and ways of setting words to music which happened to prevail at some former period (*e.g.* the days of the Vienna and Salzburg schools), and on which experience, and the improved taste of our own days, has passed an unfavourable verdict.

With this short recapitulation, which is also in part explanatory, we proceed to the second branch of our inquiry ; viz., by *whom is the music to be sung* ? or, in other words, what is to be the *matériel* of our choirs ?

We have already expressed our concurrence in the view which Canon Oakeley has put forth on this subject, though for want of space we were unable to quote from his pages. We therefore invite the attention of our readers to the following extracts from the Postscript to the "Few Words," which it will be seen sums up the whole subject. The extract is long, but we do not see that we can abridge it without injury. We may remark in passing that no attempt at an answer has yet appeared from any quarter :—

I will conclude with a brief summary of the arguments by which, as it appears to me, the substitution of choristers for female singers is recommended.

1. It would serve to place our choirs upon a permanent basis. At present they are apt to be made up of persons who are not united by any other tie than proceeds from the accident of their being gathered together at the High Mass on Sundays and Feasts of Obligation, in order to execute the music of the Mass in a mere professional spirit. They are not necessarily even Catholics, and at any rate they feel no other interest in the church where they sing, than as it is the means of affording them a casual engagement. The consequence is, that they are not at hand to give effect to any of the week-day celebrations, which accordingly form too often a miserable contrast in the musical department to the High Mass of the Sunday. On the other hand, if a church be provided with a standing choir of boys, the means are always ready of celebrating the Benedictions and other occasional offices with a certain degree of propriety and effect. It will be seen that I am all along supposing the case of such a staff of boy singers as is the product of a

musical class in each parish. The elements of such a class may generally be found among the male children who are under parochial education, and nothing more is wanted towards creating it than a competent musical instructor, who will provide that there shall be a regular supply of younger boys to take the places of those who are superannuated.

2. The effect of educating boys for the service of the choir will be that of supplying facilities for obtaining male singers to take the lower parts as time goes on. Some of the best tenors and basses in our London Catholic choirs have been choristers in Catholic churches in their earlier years, and the great advantage which they enjoy over singers who have not had this preparation is, that they are thoroughly acquainted with the ecclesiastical portion of their work. They know how to pronounce the Latin correctly; they are not dismayed by the Plain Chant of the Introit, Offertory, or Communion, and there is at all events a better security for their proper deportment in church, than in the case of those who have been accustomed to regard music simply in the light of the theatre or the casino.

3. It is thus that the training of boys will have a tendency in the course of time to render our choirs exclusively Catholic. With our actual paucity of resources, this most desirable object is impracticable, or could be obtained only at a sacrifice which would be little less than fatal to the musical department of worship. But with choirs made up of well-instructed Catholic boys for the higher parts, and *quondam* Catholic boys for the lower, there would be no place left for the admission of non-Catholic intruders.

4. The employment of boys would secure that gravity, simplicity, and chasteness, in the execution of Church music, which are so apt to be sacrificed to mere effect in the hands of professional artists. I have more than once said, that it would have no tendency to exclude from our choirs the use of varied and artistic music; but it is my own very strong opinion, founded on long experience, that it is not such music in itself which gives a secular air to the work of the choir, but the manner in which it is executed. . . . There is something about the voice of boys which is pre-eminently suited to the true idea of Christian praise, whereas it is exceedingly difficult for singers of the other sex, especially when accustomed to professional exhibitions, to tone down their mode of execution to the ecclesiastical standard. It will be said, I know, that male singers who have passed the age of boyhood are liable to the same serious defect. This I do not deny; but it is a great point to have even one-half of a choir free from it; while, if I be right in supposing, that by the substitution of boys for females in the treble parts, the whole choir would be gradually purified and catholicised, there would be a remote tendency in such a change to give a more ecclesiastical character to the musical service in general.

I come lastly to that which is, after all, the chief argument for the exclusion of females from our choirs; that their admission is opposed to the spirit and most approved practice of the Church. It has no precedent in any Catholic country in the world, and has grown up in our own and a few others under sectarian influences. Even the Established Church, which has suffered so largely from those influences, has in this instance steadily resisted them. In its cathedrals, which are the relics and witnesses of the ancient ecclesias-

ical tradition, none but exclusively male choirs have ever existed or been even imagined. Nor did I ever hear of women taking part in the service of the Anglican Church, except in the fashionable London chapels, which are certainly the last places to which one should resort for an authority in ecclesiastical matters. In the churches popularly called ritualistic, the employment of boys in the musical portion of the service is quite universal, and every accession which that great movement may bring to ourselves will be an accession of testimony and influence in favour of the same practice. More than this, I understand from those who are old enough to remember the earlier days of some of our London Catholic churches, that female singers were then entirely unknown. Now it would indeed be lamentable, if when we are making so much progress in other ways towards our rightful position, we were, so far as the conduct of Divine Worship is concerned, to recede from the standard of our forefathers. Together with the name of "chapels," which it may be hoped we are in the way to renounce once for all, let us divest ourselves of all that smacks of the chapel and dissenting system ; the pews, the pew-openers, the female sacristans, and the female choristers. One of the principal lessons taught us by our great Cardinal, was the duty of asserting in all judicious ways the dignity of our true position ; and this we can do only by ridding ourselves of sectarian habits, down even to the very fringes of our garment, and associating ourselves in spirit, and in that which forms so especial a test of the ecclesiastical spirit, the external worship of the Church, with the most approved practice of Catholic countries.

There is one argument for the introduction of females into the musical portion of worship, which strives to bear us down by the force of a religious sentiment. It is said in effect, "God has given women a voice, why then may they not use it in singing His praise in the Church ?" It might be sufficient to answer, that the Church, from the days of St. Paul, has ruled that Divine Worship is not the proper department of female ministrations. But if we must take a lower ground, it is surely enough to remark, that the same argument would justify every orator in becoming a preacher. Doubtless all gifts should be employed to the glory of the Giver ; but in what modes, and under what conditions, is a further question not settled by the mere terms of that most unanswerable proposition. There are many ways, even religious, in which females may employ their musical powers and accomplishments to that end. They can delight their families and friends by singing sacred music in the domestic or social circle ; they can join as private members of a congregation in the chants and hymns of the Church. What they may not do—according to the tradition and general practice of the Church—is to take any official part in the act of Divine worship. The deviations from this rule, which have been partially allowed in some countries, whether in deference to local circumstances, or from other causes, which always carry weight with a power so wise and so indulgent as that of the Holy See, cannot reasonably be pleaded against the tenor of the rubrics and the precedent of all parts of the Church in which her action is unfettered by non-Catholic influences.

To which we add the following from the "Few Words :"—

Not only in Rome, but in countries which retain certain national pecu-

liarities in the sacred administrations of the Church, such as France and Belgium, the practice of employing females in the musical department of divine worship is, I believe, unknown. It is almost entirely confined to those countries, such as Great Britain, parts of Germany, and the United States of America, in which Protestantism prevails and produces a certain impression on the outward aspect even of the Church herself. . . . It is hardly necessary to observe, that the admission of females into the church choir is absolutely fatal to the retention of the proper cathedral type of worship, while in parish churches, it is sometimes productive of obvious evils, and even in the best regulated administrations is adverse to the spirit which should animate every part of divine worship, and especially one so intimately connected with its dignified celebration as that of the choir. . . . Without a regular provision for elementary instruction in church music, we can never hope to place our choirs upon a permanent footing, nor to have matters conducted in an ecclesiastical way. Male singers trained by ourselves, would be able, not only to sing church music, but to understand the church offices, which is a distinct and most important qualification for an ecclesiastical choir, nowise guaranteed by a mere professional acquaintance with the art. What idea has a London vocalist, how accomplished soever, of singing the Introits, Offertories, and Communions of the Mass to the proper tone? Yet these, by a prescription of the Holy See, are to be sung in the choir as well as said by the celebrant. In these, and many other ways, the want of an ecclesiastical training in the choir will be brought home to every Catholic mind.

If we add to the above (1) the Synodical decree of the English Provincial Synod that "boys should be taught music in schools in order that females may be excluded from the choirs," (2) the decree of a recent Synod of Utrecht, which has been approved by the Holy See,\* and lastly, the fact that our "Manual" does not in any way recognise the presence of females as officiators in choirs, we shall have said all that is necessary in the way of argument and authority.

---

\* "In the same way as the object of Church Music is quite frustrated when it is of such a character as only to gratify the ears with vain pleasures, so, too, the dignity of divine worship is not preserved, unless the singers also are such as to beseem the Church. Women's voices are not admitted by ecclesiastical usage into the choir of singers, since the rules of divine worship and the dignity of ecclesiastical music evidently require their exclusion. For in the same way as they are withheld from all share in the ministry of the Holy Liturgy, so also everything effeminate ought to be quite excluded from Church singing; and hence the presence of women in an Ecclesiastical Choir is opposed to the very sense of the faithful. Therefore, we decree and order that women be altogether excluded from the choir of singers, unless in the Churches or Chapels of Nuns. And if hereafter, in violation of this injunction of this Provincial Synod, women be employed in any Church as singers or organists, let the Rectors of those Churches be aware that they will have to render a most strict account to the Ordinary for such an infraction of the law." Syn. Prov. Ultraiectan. Tit 5. cap. 6.

What seems to be wanted now is that Catholics should move unitedly and zealously in the matter; and if this is done, we have good hope that the day is not far distant, when we shall see all Catholic schools taught music systematically as part of the school system, and so on a par at least with the schools of other communities in this branch of education, as they certainly are in all others. This, as has been already said, will enable all our young people to assist in the congregational parts of the Church offices, and in the psalms, hymns, and litanies of our popular services;—while it will secure the training of the more musically-gifted boys as singers in our choirs. In the one case the boys, when grown up, will be prepared to join in the musical parts of the services of the “Holy Family” and other popular devotions—besides adding their voices in the Vesper psalms, hymns, &c.; and in the other, those who are especially trained for the choir, will not only act as soprano singers while their treble voice lasts, but will, as Canon Oakeley observes, become men-singers, and so supply in a really satisfactory manner the wants of our choirs as to adult singers, at present, perhaps, one of our greatest difficulties,\* since we have in a great majority of cases to fall back upon the services of Protestants. It will probably surprise some of our readers to learn that in this important matter of school instruction in music we have actually retrograded within the last twenty years. In proof of this we quote the following from the Report of the Poor School Committee’s Proceedings for 1849–50; the documents are far too important to be abridged.

The Vicars Apostolic, in the letter which their Lordships were pleased to address to the committee after their synodical meeting at Easter last, observed:—“The bishops particularly recommend to the attention of the committee the importance of devoting some portion of their funds to the promoting of several objects of general importance. The cultivation of music, for instance, is one which they especially recommend as of great importance, particularly as from the report given them of the success of the services of Mr. Crowe, they think these services should be secured to the Catholic schools, whether by his teaching in them, or by the publication of his works.” Several of their lordships, and in particular the Right Rev. Bishop Wiseman and the Right Rev. Bishop Ullathorne, had previously condescended, as will be remembered, to write most interesting letters in recommendation of the study of vocal music. The committee, obedient to the

---

\* We have no need, we presume, to defend ourselves from the charge of wishing to drive out females summarily from our choirs, a course which Canon Oakeley also justly deprecates. The change will no doubt take time, though if set about earnestly it need not take so long as is sometimes supposed.



wishes of the bishops, made arrangements with Mr. Crowe to secure his services for a year in twelve Catholic schools, which, by each adding a small payment to the committee's grant, have obtained the advantage of a good singing master upon easy terms. Mr. Crowe has under his care the schools of St. John's Wood, Chelsea, Hammersmith, Somers Town, Fulham, and Woolwich, and his services are much valued. The children take great interest in this part of their studies, and subscribers would derive pleasure from hearing their hearty and accurate performances. It has not escaped the notice of the committee that the engagement of a separate master to teach singing in a school, however useful in the absence of a more complete alternative, is an arrangement which, from its expense and other reasons, can never become general or permanent. They look forward to the time when ability to read music, to teach singing, and to play the organ, *will be reckoned among the ordinary qualifications of a Catholic schoolmaster.* This result can be produced only through the agency of normal schools. But meantime the means at hand may be employed to introduce the study and to lead the popular taste and interests in the desired direction.

As a result of this we have the two following reports from the music teacher addressed to the secretary :—

April 9th, 1850.

At the close of the first six months of the introduction of vocal music into the schools under the countenance of Bishop Wiseman, and the auspices of the Catholic Poor School Committee, it seems proper to address a few lines to you, in the shape of report, as to the commencement, progress, &c. of the undertaking. Accordingly I transmit the enclosed as a first or infantile statement, which I hope may be better developed as we proceed, and have more material upon which such a statement may be constructed. It will doubtless be gratifying to you to know that, at this early stage, there are now good fruits being produced from the three schools which had the advantage and happiness of commencing by means of the kind patronage of our beloved Bishop. These were commenced experimentally and without the aid of books. From these schools alone are taken about twenty boys for the choral service of the church, who are now receiving about £50 annually for their musical services. (More are employed who are not paid). A field is thus opened for their exertions ; our choirs will of necessity become better and more economically constructed, and the boys thus derive aid in their social advancement. Several of these choristers have already obtained situations in business of a more advanced grade than is usually the lot of poor-school children, and have been chosen (other points of character being equal) on account of their musical attainments. I may, perhaps, mention one who is now in the service of a music-printer, receiving satisfactory wages, and whose master dispenses with the usual premium required (from £30 to £50, I am informed), on account of the musical knowledge and aptitude of the boy. The pupils thus readily appreciate, and with gratitude, the gift that is being conferred upon them in the cultivation of that which, besides being recreative, is attended with advantages which they could not otherwise possess.

Nov. 26th, 1850.

I have much pleasure in placing before you the enclosed report of the second half-year's state of the schools with respect to the cultivation of vocal music ; for, although there are a few cases which present themselves unfavourably, yet even from these information and some degree of satisfaction may be derived ; for it now appears evident that, in every instance where the master or mistress practises regularly, and books are provided, the school advances well, and, in some instances, even without the direct aid of the master, where the pupil-teachers are apt . . . . The scholars are now receiving a higher amount of pecuniary recompense for their musical labours than before, and this with advantage to all parties. Another has been taken into the employ of a music-printer, who speaks highly of his abilities. Repeated instances occur of the parents of the pupils coming to express their gratitude for the benefits they have derived from the musical instruction of their children. This, again, is made apparent in the happy faces and new clothing of the children, of which I am a constant witness. Two little choristers were a short time ago examined, and afterwards offered 10s. per week each, with other inducements, to sing at " a respectable evening concert " ; the parents, however, taking advice, declined the offer. The mother came to inform me of their decision, and to return thanks for the benefits her children were receiving by means of their musical education. I find *the boys much attached to the Church service* : they will make great exertions, and endure privations, rather than be absent when their services are required.

It should be added that the proceedings of the musical teacher were superintended by a council of clergy and laity nominated by the Bishop, at the head of which were the late Canon O'Neal and the then Vicar-General, Dr. Whitty. The promising nature of the movement is sufficiently shown by the above documents. Another proof was a meeting of school children held at S. George's, where a number of sacred pieces were sung, in unison and in parts, with very considerable taste and accuracy. It is also worthy of notice that though what was done was little more than a sowing of the seed, yet some of the results may even now be traced, as some boys who were then taught, are at this time to be found acting as organists or singers in Catholic churches.

Accidental circumstances put a period to the labours of the music-master, and the difficulty of finding a proper successor, and consequent breaking up of the council,—owing partly to the illness of the late Cardinal, who had been the soul and life of the whole movement—left the schools without the means of continuing what had been begun.\*

---

\* We have said that we have retrograded during the last twenty years ; we may also add that as a consequence we are behind other communities, almost all of whom have been regularly working on in this direction. We cannot but take the opportunity of noticing here the remarkable success

We may add, in passing, Cannon Oakeley's remark that it is believed to be not so very long since boys were ousted from some of the Catholic choirs where females are now employed. The history of these changes would be a curious and interesting one, but this is not the place for it.

It is easy to see how immensely improved might have been our position had the work begun by the Bishops and the Poor-School Committee been continued to the present time; and we own that many priests, as well as school teachers, look back with regret to its cessation. The plan, too, of having a master to go from school to school is so feasible and so economical that we cannot doubt it will receive, if it has not already received, the consideration of our present Archbishop; who in his letter to Canon Oakeley evinces so lively an interest in the subject, and who has already done so much for the schools, and for the young of his diocese.\*

And now it may be interesting to compare the state of our schools, as regards musical proficiency, not with other schools of the present day, but with those of our forefathers in the old days of Catholic England. Thus writes the accomplished author of "*Christian Schools and Scholars.*" The passage is so interesting that we make no apology for giving it entire.

"But the fact is that, in one respect, the rude, ignorant peasantry of the Middle Ages were a great deal more learned than the pupils of our modern schools. In a certain sort of way, every child was rendered familiar with the language of the Church. From infancy they were taught to recite their prayers, the antiphons, and many parts of the ritual of the Church, in Latin, and to understand the meaning of what they learnt; and hence they became familiar with a great number of Latin words, so that a Latin discourse would sound far less strange in their ears than in those of a more educated audience of the same class in the present day. In many cases, indeed, the children who were taught in the priest's, or parochial school, learnt grammar, that is, the Latin language; but all were required to learn the Church chant, and a

---

which has attended the labours of the "*Tonic Sol-Fa Association,*" and which we think clearly proves the superiority of that plan of musical instruction, *i.e.* the principle of the one scale (which is quite irrespective of the peculiar mode of printing adopted by the Society). We too might by this time have had our 5,000 children ready to take part in an annual festival.

\* We are far, of course, from wishing to exclude secular music from our schools. The part songs and other pieces at present in use are excellent in their way (though too often confined to the girls' school), and we think that the practice of such would always be desirable as a means of innocent recreation. Indeed we do not think that any mission would be complete without its choral society. But there is no reason why a higher aim should not also be included, and the singing-class be made to contribute, as it easily might, to the beauty and fulness of the services in church.

considerable number of Latin prayers, and hymns, and psalms.\* This point of poor-school education deserves more than a passing notice. Its result was, that the lower classes were able thoroughly to understand and heartily to take part in the rites and offices of Holy Church. The faith rooted itself in their hearts with a tenacity which was not easily destroyed, even by penal laws, because they imbibed it from its fountain source—the Church herself. She taught her children out of her own ritual, and by her own voice, and made them believers after a different fashion from those much more highly educated Catholics of the same class who, in our day, often grow up almost as much strangers to the liturgical language of the Church as the mass of unbelievers outside the fold. Can there be any incongruity more grievous than to enter a Catholic school, rich in every appliance of education, and to find that in spite of the time, money, and method lavished on its support, its pupils are unable to understand and recite the Church offices, and are untrained to take part in Church Psalmody? The language of the Church has, therefore, in a very literal sense, become a dead language to them, and it is from other and far inferior sources that they derive their religious instruction. Thus they are ignorant of a large branch of school education, in which the children of a ruder and darker age were thoroughly trained; no doubt, on the other hand, they know a great many things of which children in the Middle Ages were altogether ignorant, and the question is simply to determine which method of instruction has most practical utility in it. Without dogmatising on this point, we may be permitted to regret that through any defect in the system of our parochial schools, Catholic congregations should in our own days be deprived of the solemn and thorough celebrations of those sacred offices which in themselves comprise a body of unequalled religious instruction; and that in an age which makes so much of the theory of education, we should have to confess our inability to teach our children to pray and sing the prayers of the Church, as the children of Catholic peasants prayed and sang them six hundred years ago. The English schools of that

---

\* We subjoin a few more passages from the same author: S. Godric is said to have learned (in a poor school at Durham) many things of which he was before ignorant, “by hearing, reading, and *chanting* them.” In the parochial schools, even from S. Dunstan’s time, children of the lower orders were taught grammar and *Church Music*. Schools of greater or less pretensions were attached to most parish churches, and the scholars assembled in the parish. Thus, in 1300, we read of children being taught to *sing* and read in the parish of S. Martin’s, Norwich. At Stoke-by-Clare there was, besides the extensive college, a school in which boys were taught “grammar, *singing*, and good manners.” To which answer the pictures in Chaucer of the schools in which children were taught:

That is to say, to singe and to rede,  
As small children do in their childhede.

Again:

As he sate in the scole at his primere,  
He Alma Redemption heard sing, &c.

The whole habits of education and devotion, in fact, had a liturgical element which, we fear to our detriment, is now lacking.

period enjoyed the benefit of no other inspection than that of the parish priest and the archdeacon, 'the eye of the bishop' as he was called; and if their pupils knew little about 'monocotyledons,' the 'crustacea,' or grammatical analysis, they were able to recite their Alma Redemptoris and their Dixit Dominus with hearty, intelligent devotion. They knew the order of the Church service, and could sing its psalms and antiphons in the language of the Church, and to her ancient tones; and so they did not, through their ignorance, oblige their pastors to lay aside, as obsolete, the use of that office so truly called Divine, in order to substitute in its place English hymns and devotions from any less inspired source." \*

Mr. Nary "heartily sympathizes with Canon Oakeley in wishing that female singers should be excluded from the choirs," but he thinks that this would necessitate the exclusion of much of the figured music for which the Canon pleads; since, if it is to be done at all, it should be done full justice to, and this he thinks can only be by the employment of female voices.†

We are inclined to think, however, that Mr. Nary has really exaggerated the difficulty. It is certain that there is very much modern music that may be sung with effect by boys, and as to what cannot—this is the very kind which Canon Oakeley himself implies should not be admitted. We here again revert to our "Manual," and we believe that if music is selected according to its rules there will be no difficulty. We think, too, that Mr. Nary has rather confused the matter when he endeavours to prove that women's voices need not give a secular air to the performance of Church Music, because in an evening service more than half the people who join in the

\* We have retained the last few lines of this extract, though not necessary for our purpose, in order to correct a misapprehension. Those who promote English hymns and devotions among the people do not, as is here implied, desire to put aside thereby the divine office. The movement in favour of vernacular devotions is promoted by many clergy and laity, anxious to attach the young and the common people to the Church and its services, and they think it desirable that *both* the regular offices and the vernacular should be used for this purpose, according as circumstances may require. And as to the matter of the English devotions used, they are principally the Hymns of the Church translated, or others of like character; selections from the Psalter; and Prayers from the "Raccolta." We will not pursue, however, at present the question of popular devotions, as we hope it may form the subject of a paper in a future number of this REVIEW.

† One point is sometimes overlooked, viz., the *paucity of really good female singers*. We cannot often afford to hire real *artistes*; and better the honest, blunt, if not always refined, way in which boys sing, than the mincing affectation of some third or fourth-rate lady singer, who in most cases cannot even pronounce the words. And surely nothing can possibly exceed the unpleasantness, to use a very mild word, of the *passé* female voice, such as we not unfrequently hear it in many of our choirs.

Benediction Music are females. The question is not as to all joining in congregational singing, but as to *females being the leaders and officiators in the choir of singers properly so called*. This remark, we may say in passing, applies not only to the case of professional singers, but to the too common practice of setting up girls of the middle or lower classes to act as *cantors*, sing solo parts in Litanies, Magnificats, &c. Here, not to speak of the moral danger to these persons themselves, from the show and conceit which are apt to be engendered in minds of that class,—a danger which experience has unhappily proved to be a very real one,—we shall have in time the same jealousies and quarrels that exist in more aristocratic choirs, and which are far less likely to exist among boys. If girls must be employed, *let it be a rule that several sing together*. But the cantor's or alternate parts we should think could always be taken in the sanctuary.

We have heard of easy Masses being sung with very good effect by a choir of select school children, both boys and girls, in a side chapel near the altar. This, in default of anything better, there could be no objection to; but boys must not be excluded; nor must they or the girls be sent into a gallery.

To return. We agree with Canon Oakeley that, even in a gallery, boys' voices have very much the advantage of women's in point of religious effect; though the gain would be very much greater were they in their proper place in the body of the church. And here a caution should be added: the employment of boys' voices, though it will be far less offensive, yet can never do away altogether with the unpleasant effect of music otherwise objectionable. Indeed, we have heard of most painful attempts at operatic airs, bravura passages, solo "O Salutaris," &c., by a single boy put up to exhibit himself on some great occasion. But these things, we trust, are passing away.

Before concluding this part of our subject, it may be of use if we say a few words on two points, on which some persons who grant all that we have said, may yet apprehend a practical difficulty under existing circumstances. We allude (1) to the finding of a sufficient supply of boys for choir purposes, and (2) to the keeping them out of moral danger when we have inducted them, so to say, into their office; for the idea of merely hiring a boy instead of a female singer, and taking no further care of him, we do not for a moment entertain.

First then as to the supply of boys. This point has been almost anticipated in what we have already said on the partially successful attempt made twenty years ago. This, if



it had been persevered in, would no doubt have rendered the present discussion unnecessary. But if, as is unfortunately the case, we have to begin *de novo*, we certainly begin under more favourable circumstances. With the vast improvements which have taken place in our missions and schools since the period referred to, we cannot doubt that in a very few years, a proper system of musical tuition being supposed, our churches will be furnished with an abundant supply of well-trained *enfants de chœur*.

We may remark here that long habit seems to have had a tendency to make us distrust our own resources. The custom of employing female professionals had become a thing so taken for granted that few thought of turning their attention to the school, and hence one constantly meets with instances where considerable resources exist in the way of boy-material, but which are allowed to run to waste, simply from no one having thought of turning them to account. One writer tells us of a Catholic church in a large town in the country, with a good congregation, and a superior school, but where the boys simply occupy their side aisle in the church, and never open their mouths. A few of the girls, he says, occasionally sing in an organ gallery, but evidently without proper musical instruction. In the same town, moreover, is a High Church place of worship, carried on by voluntary support, and where there is a school of a similar kind to that of the Catholic mission, the boys indeed if anything being hardly so respectable. Here the incumbent has a class of boys who have been so well drilled that they can sing the Magnificat and sundry metrical hymns in church every evening with very good effect. Another informant, writing from a populous town, speaks of a spacious church, to which is attached a very fine boys' school, and one which stands high in the inspector's report. Here there is, or was, a Saturday evening's Benediction, at which the boys of the upper school attend. The look of these youths as they pass by and fill the aisle is beautiful; but when the rite begins, to the visitor's surprise not a single voice is heard.

We have quoted the above as being evidently samples of a like state of things in hundreds of other places, and as showing the great improbability of a want of material throughout the country. Of course some localities will be more favourably circumstanced than others. The midland and northern counties will probably furnish better and more abundant material than the southern. It is surprising, as to the former, what results follow from careful training. It may be mentioned, as an instance of Lancashire, that a very promising

tenor, who lately sang at a concert at Liverpool, was originally a boy who sang in the streets. This, of course, is an exceptional case, but it is so far to our point. Then there are the well-known choral singers of Bradford and elsewhere.

One more remark may be added. Strangers have often noticed the row of boys in surplices lining the altar at Vespers and Benediction, and have expressed great surprise that their presence should be little more than ornamental, and that they never on any occasion open their mouths; while perhaps some bold, strong-voiced girls stand up outside the sanctuary to sing the solo parts in the litanies, &c. One writer, we observe, has called these boys, not inaptly, the row of "dummies"; and, without saying that no boy who cannot sing should be allowed to enter the sanctuary, one may safely suggest that the two things might more often be combined than they are.

Turning now to the second point, the moral guidance of the choir boy, our readers are aware that we have always considered this subject as one of the greatest moment. We said not long since, "Besides the musical training of our youth, it is of the highest importance that moral training and supervision should go hand in hand with it. Rather we would say that without this the other will be of questionable value. With regard to the young persons to whom we have alluded as taking part in the service with the general congregation, they will of course be subject to such general supervision and guidance as may be afforded by the charitable institutions of their parish and the influence of those above them, but as regards those who may be chosen as choristers, we consider that a very special care should be exercised over them, and we do so in the confidence that it will be amply repaid. Experience has justified the expectation that out of such a care and training the character of many a good Catholic layman would be formed; and surely, at the present time, when the want of a Catholic middle class is increasingly felt, such a result would be of peculiar value. Nay, we do not doubt that in many cases, if due care were taken, even higher vocations would be elicited."

We take this opportunity of repeating the same caution, but we must add that we have no *fear*; and we believe that if due care be taken, and the various means resorted to which experience shows us are needed for the guidance of the young at so critical an age, we need have no doubt as to the result. Canon Oakeley very well remarks, as a reason for his unswerving faith in the result of his undertaking to provide a choir of boys, that it was not likely that what the Church

desired, and in behalf of which our own prelates had made a precise decree, could be a thing unattainable ; so we may say we cannot think that what the bishops have ordered to be done can be beyond the power of the clergy, assisted by the laity, to carry out in such a way as shall not damage the souls of the young whom it is desired they should train for the service of the choir. Failures have occurred, as is natural ; failures may occur again ; and it will always be a matter for consideration how far the experience of the past can be made to bear upon the future, so as to avoid dangers not before so well foreseen.\* In fact, wherever we turn, not only in this department, but in every other, there are pitfalls. We allow, *e.g.*, a dance at a school feast, and some girl will imbibe thereby a taste for dances in general, and will propose perhaps to her mistress to give her an evening a week out for the purpose (a fact of recent occurrence). Again, we have a dramatic entertainment ; a taste for the low theatres may thus be engendered in some ; and to gratify this taste a boy has been known to steal his master's money. Even our general high-class education, unless something systematic is done to guide our young people who leave school, will be an equally dangerous gift, and the only result of learning to read will, in many cases, be that the youth takes for his literary pabulum the weekly number of the "Lives of the Highwaymen," or the "Popular Novelist ;" eventually, perhaps, much worse things.

Yet in none of these cases do we give up the use of a practice because of its possible abuse. Against such abuse we believe that the principles and practices of our holy faith duly implanted, with such appliances of other kinds as easily suggest themselves, will be by God's blessing, in the great majority of instances, an effectual barrier. A great protection, too, in the matter specially before us, will be found in

---

\* It may be worth adding that one of the chief things that used to be supposed to tempt a choir boy from his home on an evening is in gradual process of disappearance, owing to the changes which have taken place in public taste, and the kind of musical entertainments which have become so widely popular. The style of the "Oxford" and "Canterbury" Halls, with their operatic music, &c., involves the employment of female voices, and the old-fashioned vocal chorus in which boys used to take a part barely holds its ground. In the respectable places where it still exists, the boys are not ill cared for, either physically or morally, and those of a less reputable kind it is not difficult to keep clear of. Of course, upon our idea of moral guidance and supervision, the former even would not be thought of ; but in the absence of this, and supposing boys to be allowed to do as they like, the danger would not be greater, if so great, as if they were left on the streets, or among the low theatres of the metropolis.

the feeling of responsibility for the performance of a sacred office which even boys may be made to feel, and which they will feel, if those above them, and who have the charge of them, show that they view the work of the choir in this light. The performance will then be begun in the spirit of the "Aperi, Domine of the office," a spirit far different from that engendered by the scramble into a gallery, where it is difficult even to keep up the idea that the singers are in the church at all. As we have before remarked, "if we are to save ourselves from disappointment with our choristers, we must make up our mind to give them all the sacred associations which our ecclesiastical system provides us with." It is well known that in the cathedrals and parish churches of France the *maitrise* or choir-school is an object of special care. A youthful band of some twelve or fourteen *enfants de chœur*, enjoying a holiday excursion in company with the clergy and other parishioners, a sight one may easily come across in a French town on a summer's day, gives us a glimpse of the paternal way in which such things may be managed. And here, too, we may cite the testimony of an English parish priest, who has had much experience in the care of singing boys. He expresses his belief that the fears sometimes entertained on this subject are more imaginary than real, and that, with a sound religious and moral training, and a good set of rules carefully acted on, he has never found any difficulty worth speaking of in the management of his choir.

We may add, as confirmatory of these remarks, that even in bodies external to us, but who follow closely in externals many Catholic practices, this way of dealing with choir-boys has been found effectual. Means are adopted from the beginning to mark their employment in this church as a sacred thing. On the whole, we have no reason to fear. Let us not doubt our own strength; to do so is as fatal an error on the one side as a tempting of Providence would be on the other, and since we have a clear line of duty to follow, let us believe that if we do it aright we shall not be disappointed in the result.

### III.

*Where should the singers be located?* is the next point to be considered.

We take the liberty of quoting on this subject the few words we said on this subject in our January number:—

"We think that the good effect to be derived from this change in the material of our choirs will hardly be realized unless we at the same time alter

the *locale* of the singers. In this respect we have been equally out of harmony with ecclesiastical tradition and practice ; and if we are to save ourselves from disappointment with our choristers, we must make up our minds to give them the advantage of all the sacred associations which that system provides. In other words, we must substitute a proper choral arrangement in connection with the Sanctuary for that now prevailing, and with which so many abuses are unhappily connected. There need, we think, be no practical difficulty about this, and we would suggest it as a matter worthy of serious consideration by our clergy and Catholic architects who are about to build or restore churches. The time is surely gone by for the stereotyped plan of an east-end with an altar under a large window, flanked by a smaller altar on either side, involving besides other inconveniences the impossibility of making any provision for the proper choral arrangements. Several instances might be adduced of churches recently erected in which the beautiful and convenient feature of side altars has been introduced, thus allowing the choir to occupy their proper place,—the organ of course being placed at the side, and ample space being still left for the Sanctuary proper. We should say that even in cases where boys cannot be at once procured for the choir it is very unadvisable to plan a building in such a way as to preclude a proper arrangement afterwards. Even a mixed choir can be accommodated *pro tempore* at the side of the chancel and contiguous to the organ ; a plan, by the bye, which would go far towards securing that decorum among the singers, which the clergy find it quite impossible to enforce when they are placed at so great a distance as a west-end gallery.”

Since these lines were written, we have reason to believe that more general attention has been drawn to this important point, and that the substance of the above remarks has met with a very general response in several influential quarters. Mr. Nary seems to admit that a church should, if possible, be “in possession of a choir connected with the sanctuary”;—though we wish he had said so more distinctly ;—and Canon Oakeley, as we see in the note to his Letter, thinks that in the “construction of all new churches, a provision for a choir near the sanctuary should be made indispensable.” Our Manual clearly implies the same, and in one of its instructions even “*forbids galleries over the doors of churches,*” in order, as it says, “to prevent persons listening to the music with their backs to the altar” (p. 28). It is also forbidden to the conductor of the choir to have his back to the altar or to the people, when leading (*ibid.*). If a *tribune* is necessary for the singers, in default of their normal position in the choir (p. 12), such tribune is to be “*not far removed from the sanctuary*” (p. 13); or again, it is to be “*at the sides of the altar*” (p. 28).

These plans can of course be easily carried out in new churches ; and it is well known that our Catholic architects are quite prepared to do so, without additional expence to the

building, and with the preservation of the same conveniences as to sanctuary, altars, sacristy, &c., as at present ; or rather we may say with some additional advantage in point of arrangement. In larger churches, besides the choir seats properly so-called (in front of the sanctuary, but of course not hiding the altar), there might be a space adjoining the chancel and the organ, in which additional singers could, if necessary, be placed, and in which also orchestral performers could be conveniently located ; and it is only in large town churches where such performers would be employed. Even with regard to churches already built, it would not in general be difficult to arrange a constructional chancel ; or, if this is impossible, a tribune, or enclosed space, might be provided, near the sanctuary of course, and with the organ adjoining.

The question of the orchestra in church, we may here add, is rather a controverted one. The last "instruction" in the "Manual" states that "the use of instrumental music is in a simple state of toleration ;" and by the synod of Utrecht it is expressly ordered that permission must in each case be asked ; all which seems to show that orchestral accompaniments are to be used with caution, and only in circumstances where it is clear that no evil will result. Canon Oakeley has advanced strong reasons in the case of his own church for their retention, and we own to having often heard them there with peculiar pleasure. But his is just a case of that exceptional kind which seems almost to prove the contrary rule. Abstractedly, too, it is probable that most musical people would prefer a variety in the way of performance—that is, sometimes orchestra, sometimes organ, sometimes voice alone—just as is the case in secular music, where every kind has its place, and pleases in its turn. But granting the use of the orchestra, it appears still that a gallery over the door is generally to be considered inexpedient, clashing as it does with the instructions in the Manual. And, as we have seen above, another arrangement can without much difficulty be made.

To return : the effect of the arrangement we have described would be to impart an ecclesiastical character to the whole service, as well as to get rid of the abuses which are found to be inseparable from a number of persons assembled in a curtained enclosure in a distant part of the church, and so withdrawn from the observation and surveillance of the clergy. Architecture, too, would generally gain ; for at present it is not unusual to find an expensive window with handsome tracery in the tower, or over the door of the church, completely destroyed, as an architectural feature, by an organ placed in front of it. When, as in many country churches,



the organ is small, it looks even worse, and what might be made an ornamental feature near the altar, becomes, when placed upstairs, a positive eyesore. Nor is the case mended when, as is sometimes the case, the window is left open to view, and a structure raised in one corner to contain the organ and singers. It is worth adding that on the plan described much smaller organs than those in general use would suffice, and thus a saving probably of £400 or £500 to the Church. We hear of organs being built at the present day on a scale out of all proportion with the churches in which they are placed; while too frequently a very inferior degree of attention is paid to that for which, after all, the organ is only the accompaniment.

It must be remembered, too, that a gallery near the ceiling of the church is generally a bad place both for organ and singers. Much of the effect is lost, and what there is will be found, especially as to the voices, to be much coarser and harder than when the waves of sound have a freer space. It may also be suggested that the cause of congregational singing at Vespers, &c., would be advanced by the plan proposed, since experience shows that people follow and join more readily and heartily when they see the singers and organ before them, and as it were in the midst of them.

As the question of congregational singing has been mooted, and as the subject is becoming one of increasing importance and interest, we propose to devote our remaining space to its consideration. It is probable that we have ourselves partly been the cause of this subject being brought into prominence in Mr. Nary's and Canon Oakeley's pamphlets, by our taking for granted that the proposals of the latter, though mainly directed to the training of select singers for the choir, were also meant to extend, to the youth of our schools generally, the advantage of musical tuition, though of course of a less scientific kind. He had expressly spoken of females joining, as part of the congregation, in the chants and hymns of the Church, and we did not suppose he intended this privilege to be confined to one sex only,—more especially as the other has temptations to contend with, against which an attraction of this kind would be of the greatest value as a counterbalance. The main subject of our remarks no doubt, as of Canon Oakeley's, was that of choir service. But as the question of large bodies of persons singing at Mass, and other offices of the Church, has been started, it will be well to consider it; and for this purpose we begin as before by quoting our two authors.

Mr. Nary first adduces arguments and authorities to prove that the congregation at large are entitled to join in singing the offices of the Church—the Mass included. We admit the force of much that he has said, and would have no objection to it with this condition, that there be a place found in his system for what the Church, as we have already seen, recognizes—the use of “figured music,” as well as a distinct provision for trained choirs, who, when there is congregational singing, may be able to lead and direct it: which indeed is the most fitting plan.

Mr. Nary proceeds as follows :—

It is only plain chant, or music simple as plain chant, that will ever really revive congregational singing. “Another and rather obvious argument in favour of the simpler music is,” says the accomplished essayist in the old DUBLIN REVIEW, “the opportunity which it gives for embracing the greatest number in the direct act of choral worship.” Shall we ever see the day when the simple chant of the Church shall be taught in all schools, along with the way of making the sign of the Cross, or the manner of assisting at Mass? Shall we live to see the day when, on entering a Catholic church during service time, we shall be struck, not with the damping spectacle of a congregation partly composed of unbelievers in the act of enjoying the pleasure of a Sunday concert, while the remainder, with closed books in their lap, or by their side, wait patiently or impatiently till the prolonged and a hundred times repeated *Amen* of the Gloria or the Creed deign to come to an end, but with the refreshing sight of an unmixed body of true worshippers, learned and ignorant, high and low, rich and poor, unostentatiously led by a select choir, engaged in heartily singing the praises of Him in Whose house they are assembled? To so consoling and truly Catholic a state of things should all our reforms tend; for it will only be when it is established that we shall be able to taste the sweetness, as well as delight in the beauty and feel the grandeur of that congregational singing which so many desire, but which is incompatible with an encouragement in churches of the music of *Don Giovanni*, *Fidelio*, *Lodoiska*, *Il Barbiere*, and *Faust*.

Then the writer would here use an argument which certainly ought to have no little weight with some of his suffering brethren, be they of those who have long sustained the struggle, or of those who are only just beginning to face, with feelings of wonder, that terrible enemy, concerning the nature of which the college lectures, most unfairly, left them entirely in the dark. The congregational singing of plain chant, or of music simple as plain chant, is the destruction of the tyranny of the choir. For though, in the performance of congregational plain chant, a choir is needed to lead the people, such a choir is a very different thing from the choir which now sheds gloom over the priestly life. The hired professionals or the amateur singers, down to the boy choristers, so fully conscious of your absolute need of them, may all be dispensed with. Plain chant is written for the compass of voice common to the generality of mankind. When once a good execution of it had been established among the congregation, no difficulty could be experienced in

securing the requisite number of voices to make a choir. If any became dissatisfied, their places would immediately be filled up with more disinterested candidates. As, in plain chant, there is no scope for brilliant display, no undue prominence for any one, there would be but few, if any, temptations to vanity, no bitter preferences, no wounded feelings, in short, none of those sad accompaniments of a modern English Catholic Church choir. In the writer's opinion, a priest, whose great grievance in life is his choir, deserves little sympathy if he refuses to take any notice of a remedy which would set both his conscience and his heart at rest.

Let us now hear Canon Oakeley :—

. . . . The spirit of song is contagious, and thus it is undeniably true that the arrangements I have ventured to advocate do actually bear, indirectly, upon what is called "congregational" singing. At the same time, I should not be candid did I not avow my impression that the Mass itself is not the proper department of popular vocalism. I delight in the many-voiced responses to the Litanies ; I prefer (as a rule) to all others, those Benediction hymns in which all the people can join, and am quite prepared to believe that the Plain Chant *Te Deum*, sung by a multitude of enthusiastic worshippers, would be a religious treat of a very high order. But I am not disposed, as at present minded, to acquiesce in the view that the choral portions of the Mass are intended to be sung by the people. I think that the Mass is most properly regarded as an act in which the people are to share, in the way of attention and meditation rather than of direct and personal participation, and hence it is that I am favourable to such music as aids those mental operations, though I am as far as possible from denying that the Plain Chant, properly executed, may be such. Moreover, I am not prepossessed in favour of the practice by my own experience. Perhaps I have been unfortunate in the instances which have come before me, but I must say that they have not converted me to it. I once heard a Plain Chant Mass thus executed in France, and a real execution it was, as far as the music was concerned. The Plain Chant undoubtedly requires, for its due effect, a great number of voices ; but I humbly conceive that they should be the voices of select persons who have also got ears, not of a multitude of excellent people, some screaming, others grunting, others mispronouncing the Latin, others singing out of time, others out of tune, and the whole together resulting in a concert, but certainly not of sweet sounds. If a certain number of persons in the body of the worshippers could be trained to join in with the choir, the effect would, no doubt, be excellent and most impressive ; but if once we give out that the music of the Mass is meant to be what is called "congregational," we shall run the risk of having the music marred by unmusical intruders.

The above are certainly very fair statements of what can be said *pro* and *con*. We can easily imagine a priest, without adopting entirely Mr. Nary's line as to the exclusion of figured music, yet to a certain extent acting upon the views he has enunciated, and preferring on the whole a system of congre-

gational music to the hired services of a small number of singers. Especially would this be the case when the alternative was a choir of men and women of the usual kind, displaying all the tricks of their profession, and disgusting the more tasteful of the congregation by the "hundred times repeated (or rather bellowed out) Amens," of which Mr. Nary speaks, and of which all of us have had but too much experience. More still if the effect of the congregational singing were to make his church services more attractive and more numerous attended than before, and (if we may whisper so mundane a consideration) his offertories more productive;—for such, if we are rightly informed, has really been the case in more places than one. Another consideration, in favour of the principle at least, is to be found in the very common practice of congregational singing at Mass in the Catholic churches on the Continent; not, however, to the exclusion of choir singing, but combined with it. In France for instance, and also throughout Germany, it is almost the normal thing; and not only so, but the bishops, almost without exception, have of late years exhorted the clergy and people to cultivate still more the Plain Chant, in order that the offices of the Church may be celebrated with a still fuller body of voice, and with still greater beauty and accuracy; though it is to be remarked that they do not therefore reject the use of harmonised music, and certainly not the system of trained choirs. Indeed, as we know, a choir of men and boys in their proper place in the church is a *sine quâ non* in every French church, old or new, large or small. The late Bishop of Langres led the way in a pastoral on the subject of remarkable clearness and force:—

"The Song of the Church," says he, "does not attain the end desired unless a number of voices unite to sing it. It is, therefore, one of the cares of our ministry to spread the knowledge and practice of it among the faithful, and particularly the young people. We therefore formally express our desire that lessons be regularly given by all the schoolmasters of our diocese to the children entrusted to their care, and that in the course of the week the prayers of the following Sunday be studied and practised by all together with hearty application. Thus, children will come to contract a love for the divine offices, as they acquire the taste for and the knowledge and freedom of the holy melodies of the Church; and when a few generations should have been thus formed, and the most intelligent part of the population shall have contracted the happy custom of taking a vocal share in the public worship, a natural attraction would ally itself to the motives of faith, to attract people to the house of God; and it would become almost impossible that the public services of such a parish should be ignored, as they too often are by the men. Who shall grant us to see the day when the services of our Church shall no longer consist of a few solitary voices; but of the voices of the whole

Christian assembly, joining together in the same confession of faith, the same acclamations of love, the same expressions of prayer? . . . Far from thinking that in occupying ourselves with this subject we derogate from the dignity of our ministry, we consider ourselves to be performing an imperious duty, and providing for an urgent necessity."

It can hardly be denied that to accustom the people to join in the music has a wonderful tendency to strengthen their attachment to the Church and her offices; and perhaps this is one of the strongest arguments in favour of congregations joining in the singing, and supplies a reason that would hold good even when to a highly refined musical ear the performance might be of a mediocre or even repulsive kind. Thus much at least seems tolerably certain, that in the present day choir performances must be largely supplemented by the popular element if we are to keep our hold upon the people generally, especially the young. And what is true of our own people will apply to those external to us; for nothing is more likely to attract and impress the casual attendant at Catholic services than the heartiness and fulness with which they are rendered.\*

With regard to Canon Oakeley's objections, they seem to a considerable extent to rest on his own experience: that is, we take

\* Striking instances have been related of the advantages of accustoming the people at large to the music of the Mass, by which they retain a remembrance and love for it after a lapse of years. One instance was given some time ago in a letter from a French missionary, who came upon some converts in the wilds of America, who had long been deprived of all the privileges of the Church, but who remembered and could sing the Credo in the chant which they had been taught years before. Another was that of some sailors who, when Mass was to be celebrated on deck, offered to sing the whole through to the Church Chant—and did so from memory. To which may be added the words of the Bishop of Langres, speaking of the tradition of the Church Chant among the French people, "My dear friends and brethren, we have ourselves never seen precisely those sweet days of faith, but in our early youth we seem to have caught, as it were, their last twilight: we well remember that the sounds which first caught our ear were the sweet melodies of the Liturgy, and during that reign of terror when they were banished from our churches we bless God on recollecting the evenings when we were allowed to sing with the family the mysteries of that faith, at one time in the language of the Church, at another in the tongue of our ancestors." How like S. Jerome, when he says of the people of his day:—"Wherever you turn, the labourer at his plough sings an alleluia; the reaper sweating under his work refreshes himself with a psalm; the vinedresser in his vineyard will sing a passage from the Psalmist."

To which may be appropriately added the old but still fresh words of S. Augustine, on congregational psalmody: "What better employment there can be for a congregation of people met together, what more beneficial to themselves, or more holy and well pleasing to God, I am wholly unable to conceive."

it, not from what he has himself attempted, but what he has heard elsewhere. That the performance of the High Mass in France is too often, as he says, a "real execution," cannot unhappily be denied, and an unfortunate thing it is. Still we must remember that there are places of which report speaks very differently; and in all the evil is capable of remedy. It would be unfair, therefore, to condemn congregational singing altogether because it is sometimes bad, unless we could show that it must always necessarily be so. What is wanted in France, and on the Continent generally, is the *improvement of the singing*. The introduction, too, of even a small mixture of harmonised music with the unison chant, such *e. g.* as an occasional motett at the Offertory or Benediction, would be another means of awakening the people to a sense of the beautiful; and they would by degrees be shamed out of their present musical indifference. We are bound to say that in several churches in Paris, where the staple is the Church Chant, such a mixture has actually been introduced, and with the best effect.

And yet the way in which Vespers are sung in most French cathedrals by a body of people old and young,—school children even,—with Christian Brothers and Sisters of Charity at their head, and each with his or her "Paroissien," is very striking—and with all its simplicity and the mingling of a cracky or tuneless voice here and there, by no means wanting in impressiveness. And even in the High Mass it is a choice, on the one hand, between the rude singing of a French country town, such *e. g.* as Tréport or St. Valery (and imagination can hardly picture its rudeness); and on the other, those frightful attempts on our own side of the Channel to "execute" the Masses of Haydn and Mozart; setting aside altogether the question as to the sort of people who usually perform the latter.

Canon Oakeley speaks of organists abroad, who, because denied the use of figured music, take their revenge by introducing the lightest kind of organ playing. We believe the state of organ music in many parts of the Continent, especially in Italy (as for example in Florence), is about as bad as it can be.\* But this arises from several causes. 1. The notorious decay of, and indifference to, sacred art among all classes. 2. The ignorance among organists of real organ playing;—of what befits the character of the instrument, and of the use to

---

\* "Sound musical taste," says a recent writer, "is gaining ground everywhere but in Italy. As to the musical services in the churches, at one time it is a *Chaconne*; at another, some part of the Office, accompanied by music, in the style of a farce."



be made of it in church. 3. The miserable way in which the Church offices are performed, which deprives them of their due respect in the eyes of the people, and throws the organist upon some objectionable way of relieving the tedium of the service. In many cathedral churches it is no better; hence the little regard the people have for the divine offices. Is this to be wondered at? In how many places are the cathedral services sung by the officiators in the spirit of the Council of Trent, where it enjoins "*that they shall reverently, distinctly, and devoutly praise the name of God in hymns and canticles in the choir appointed for psalmody?*" Of course this duty remains the same whether the people assist or not;—for the service is equally a sacrifice of praise to God; still, wherever the choral offices of the Church are properly performed, they will always appeal to the affections of a goodly number of the faithful around; while to the wayfarer they are a real refreshment and solace, when he happens to enter some ancient minster at the hour of Mass or prayer.\* It seems to us therefore that it is not so much the church chant *per se* at which people and organists so often revolt, as the corrupt and careless form in which it is performed. Should we experience this feeling *e.g.* at the services in the Benedictine Church at Belmont? or would the organist there be under a like temptation to vary the performance by polkas or waltzes?

We may here remark, that the system which commonly prevails in continental churches of omitting in choir performance the alternate clauses or verses of the text, and supplying their place by organ interludes (or *versets* as they are called), may probably be one occasion of the abuses alluded to, especially where the organist happens to be devoid of taste, or is intent only on showing his own dexterity. We may also remark here, how great an injury is caused to the chant itself, and how much the interest of the worshipper is diminished by this practice. In the Roman "*Salve Regina*"

---

\* The following remarks by a thoughtful French writer seem to show that the infrequent celebration of the Divine Office is felt to be an evil:—  
 "Quand on voit la piété se refroidir en tant d'endroits, il est naturel de craindre qu'on ne l'envoie le bon Dieu avec autant de ferveur, que le feu sacré ne languisse dans son sanctuaire. C'est le moment de se demander si les adorateurs ne seraient devenus plus froids en devenant plus rares, si le silence des temples n'a pas amené le sommeil des âmes."

("Le Saint Office considéré au point de vue de la Piété." Par un Directeur du Séminaire de St. Sulpice, 1847.)

for instance, it will at once be seen how completely the beauty and symmetry of the piece is destroyed by the omission of half its clauses, and the consequent breaking up of the chant. Instead of a continuous melody, one part naturally leading to another, we are treated to a series of “disjecta membra.” It is bad enough where the organ interludes are of a suitable kind; but where, as is too often the case, they are made to furnish an opportunity merely for the display of the powers of the organ, little or no regard being had to the character of the melody, the practice becomes unendurable. The same may be said of many Kyries, Glorias, &c. Of course the evil is less, as regards the music, in the case of the hymns and canticles, where the same melody is repeated; but even here the omission of half (sometimes even more than half) the verses has a most disappointing effect. The interludes in question were probably intended as a kind of ornament to certain parts of the Office, and as a way of marking them off from other parts, such as the Hymn and Magnificat at Vespers, as distinguished from the Psalms; the Gloria, Sanctus, &c. of the Mass, as distinguished from the Introit and Gradual, &c.; but we think it clear that with proper management, all needful adornment can be given, without any omission whatever. By the employment of different kinds of voices, and a different kind of accompaniment, or again by vocal harmony in part, the alternate clauses may be varied to any extent that may be desired. And with regard to the hymn and canticles, there could be no objection to inserting short interludes between each verse. All the words would thus be sung, and the interludes would then serve very well, both as a rest for the voices, and as an additional ornament. Indeed, in the case of the Magnificat, when, e. g., there is a procession to another altar, it would be very desirable to lengthen it out in this way rather than adopt the awkward expedient of filling up the whole time in the middle or at the end. The truth is, however, that among our friends on the Continent, the choral arrangements require in many points careful revision and readjustment. We allude to such points as these:—the relations between the organist and choir; the proper kind of accompaniment for each part of the Office; the cultivation and employment of the various kinds of voice; a proper mixture of harmonised music; the respective uses of the choir organ and the great organ (the former being too frequently at present an inefficient and inefficiently handled instrument, while the latter is little more than an opportunity for an organist’s show-off) the best means

of interesting the people in the choral services of the Church ; and many other particulars that might be mentioned.\*

The above, we are aware, is somewhat of a digression ; but the points may be new to some of our readers, and it is often both interesting and useful to compare our ways of doing things with the practices of other Catholic countries.

To return, then ; the other idea of having the Mass sung by a trained choir, and with artistic music, to which the faithful may listen, is, (provided the music be of the right kind,) perfectly legitimate ; and it must be left to circumstances and discretion to decide in each case which plan should be adopted, or whether both should have their place. If in some of our larger town congregations we could follow the continental plan of having two Masses with music, say at nine and eleven (abroad the hours are usually eight and ten), there would be an opportunity of trying the congregational plan at the earlier one.†

We venture another suggestion, which may be taken for what it is worth : might it not be practicable and advisable sometimes to turn what is called the Children's Mass into a congregational one ? The children would not be ousted, for they would then simply become the leaders of the people's singing. This would probably be one way of attaching the people *as they grow up* to the services of the Church ; for when school children only are employed to sing (and this, of course, very much as a matter of school routine), it generally happens that as soon as they leave school all their interest in it ceases. The present plan, we believe, in the "Children's Mass," is to have a series of English hymns sung almost continuously from beginning to end. Many thoughtful persons have questioned whether,—carried to the extent it is, and with

\* It is gratifying to know that in several French dioceses (*e.g.* Rouen), various improvements of the kind suggested are already in progress.

† Canon Oakeley thinks "the Mass is most properly regarded as an act in which the people share" in the way of attention and meditation, rather than of direct and personal participation, and that therefore he is not disposed "to acquiesce in the view that the choral portions of the Mass are intended to be sung by the people." It does not appear, however, that joining in the *choral* parts of the Mass *need* prevent the attitude of meditation here desired ; on the contrary, it might in many cases secure a degree of attention otherwise too often absent. It has, moreover, an immense amount of authority in its favour. Of course perfect liberty is left to individuals to assist at Mass in the way which most edifies them ; and this will be sometimes in joining the singing, sometimes in listening and meditating ;—as indeed will be the case also in those services such as Benediction, &c., where Canon Oakeley himself,—in accordance, we may remark, with the instructions in the "Ritus" for Benediction,—prefers that the people should join in the singing.

hymns of so miscellaneous a character,—this plan is likely to bring up the young in a way calculated to teach them afterwards to hear Mass well. Be this as it may, the taking up the whole time in singing hymns by the children, of which the older people who hear Mass at the same time know nothing, is often found very distracting to the latter, whereas on the plan suggested the wants of both would be met. The congregation would all join in the choral parts of the Mass, and the children might still have their hymns before and after it.

We deprecate strongly with Canon Oakeley the rushing unprepared into a congregational Mass, the result of which would in all probability be the disgust which he describes; and this all the more, that the ears of the present generation are generally more musically trained and more accustomed to sweet sounds than was the case some years ago, or is the case still with the majority of French congregations. We might certainly begin with “a certain number in the body of the worshippers,” and with careful supervision there is no doubt that in time, as Canon Oakeley says, a very excellent and impressive effect might be produced. We need not exaggerate the difficulty, nor should we forget that in this country musical education among all classes has arrived at a high pitch, and that what was impossible at one time may be perfectly possible now. We understand that among other religious bodies, the fulness and precision with which whole congregations are taught to join in their services (and these, as a whole, not really more simple than our own) is quite remarkable. It only needs the re-establishment of the system of musical instruction in our schools, of which we have before spoken (which would only, after all, be in accordance with the *bene legere, bene construere, bene cantare* of old times), to bring us up to the same level, and enable our people to join heartily in our own services, which are, of course, of a far more beautiful and impressive character.\*

---

\* We have all heard of the astonishing effect produced by simple melodies sung by a large body of voices. Not to speak of the recent Centenary at Rome, which may be thought an exceptional case, there are many instances of the same kind, though on a smaller scale, such as the *Te Deum*, Hymns, &c., at Notre Dame de Paris, sung by 5,000 voices; and again, the *Miserere*, or *De profundis*, at Notre Dame des Victoires, sung by a mass of people, words and all, from memory. It is also well known, that when performances of the *Requiem Mass*, *Stabat Mater*, *Lauda Sion*, &c., have taken place, both in the unison melody sung by a large number of voices, and in figured music by a body of the best performers, the former has carried off the palm, even in the opinion of professional musicians. And as to unison singing, too often despised, the greatest musicians, down to the present day, have largely employed it, and have by its means produced some of their grandest effects. We may

There is one sentence in Mr. Nary's remarks which strikes us as deserving notice in a practical point of view. He says, "Plain Chant, or *music as simple as Plain Chant*." It has, no doubt, also occurred to others, that in order to have congregational singing, we need not absolutely confine ourselves to one set of melodies; and seeing that the old chant depends so much for its effect upon a large number of voices, especially of male voices, it might often be desirable, in commencing with the young, to make use of a lighter and easier style of music, in which there should be a good deal of change and variety in the melody, as well as in the organ harmonies. In these days of varied and effective organ accompaniments, much might be done in this way.

With regard to the practicability of teaching the Church chant to our people, and especially to the young, we have the opinion of the author of "Christian Schools and Scholars" before quoted to the following effect, an opinion which would appear to be founded upon personal experience:—"If this suggestion to teach Latin and the Church chant be deemed preposterous on the ground of its difficulty, we would simply beg objectors to try the experiment before passing judgment. A very short experience will prove, that with ordinary perseverance nothing is easier than to make a class of boys recite fluently and chant correctly from notes the Vespers and Compline, or the Gloria and Credo, and other portions of the Mass, and we may add that nothing seems more acceptable to the people themselves. Possibly, in a congregation thus trained, there might be fewer complaints of children behaving badly in church: when children understand and take part in what is going on, they do not behave amiss."

We should hope that the experience of this writer would encourage others to make the attempt to teach the children of the parochial school, or at least a portion of them, in the way here suggested.

We think that in most, if not all schools, a certain number of boys will be found of sufficient respectability, good behaviour, and intelligence, to render it worth while to bestow upon them a somewhat higher kind of education; and this might well include an elementary knowledge of Latin, and of

---

add that the hearty singing even of a few hundred voices will have an excellent effect. Witness, for instance, the Holy Family, and other evening services, at S. Mary's, Chelsea; where the zeal of the clergy and the skill of the organist have combined to produce a most successful result. Similar examples may be found, we believe, at St. Anne's Spitalfields, and St. Joseph's, Kingsland.

some modern language, such as French. A plan of this kind would go directly to improve and elevate a certain number at least of our male population, and would probably enable many a young man to attain a better position in life than he or his parents could otherwise have hoped for. Some would thus be qualified to become assistants in bookselling, or printing, or mercantile establishments; or in such trades as chemists, &c., where some knowledge of languages is often of itself a passport to employment; others might become teachers; the more musical again might turn out organists; and some might even show themselves hopeful candidates for an education for the priesthood. In all such cases, it is easy to see the importance of laying such a foundation, and of giving with it also such a musical instruction as would both supply our young people with a pleasing recreation, and enable them to assist intelligently in the public services of the Church. The extra cost need not be great; indeed where, as in some of our parochial schools, an upper class is formed—distinct in a great measure from the ordinary poor-school—parents are often found not only willing, but glad to pay such a higher sum as suffices to meet the additional expense.

Nor it appears to us is this subject important only as regards the middle and lower classes. It has been observed with much truth of those “who have to do with the education of the young, in whatever class of life”; that “the omission of the musico-liturgical element seems an unaccountable oversight, more especially in this day when a double current may be noticed by the most superficial observer; first in the direction of general musical cultivation, and secondly in that of a revived taste for Catholic ritual. Of both these tendencies it will surely be our highest wisdom to avail ourselves.” \*

Complaints are sometimes made of the little interest shown by the more educated classes among us in the higher departments of literature, and it is a question how far this may not be due to an inadequate acquaintance with the beauties of the Church offices, and, as a consequence, a comparative lack of the imaginative and poetic element in the character. We throw out this idea, though the scope of our present inquiry does not admit of our pursuing it.

The remark of the author above quoted, as to the behaviour of children in church, is, we should think, well worth attending to. If young people are to attend Vespers, it seems at

---

\* *Catholic Opinion*, Oct. 17. We are glad to have an opportunity of bearing testimony to the valuable services rendered by this periodical, not only on the above subject, but on many other important topics of the day.



least desirable that they should know what is being sung, even if they do not actually join. Children at the school age cannot be expected to keep up a spiritual meditation for any lengthened period, and the time of Vespers would therefore, unless intelligently employed, be apt to become one of idleness and *ennui*, as, indeed, we sometimes witness. Our nuns and teachers could with very little trouble do the same for the children here as the Sisters of Charity and Christian Brothers do in France; and it must be remembered that Vespers and Compline, with their oft-recurring Psalms, when once taught, will not readily be forgotten.

We do not here enter upon the question as to how far it is desirable to introduce Vespers in a congregation consisting chiefly of the less educated class; but if it is to be done, it should be done thoroughly, not in a maimed and incomplete manner. Under the notion of making the performance easier a practice prevails in some places of invariably singing the Sunday Vesper office; in other places only the Vespers of the Blessed Virgin. But surely this is to incur all the trouble of getting up, and accustoming the people to a Church office, and then to throw away its chief advantage—the beautiful adaptation to different days and feasts. If one office can be learned, all can. Let us suppose a class of boys to be taught Vespers. We begin with the Sunday Psalms and Magnificat, then we go on to the Vespers B. V. M., next to those of Confessor and Bishop. After this all others are easy, and the peculiarities of the coming festival have only to be prepared for beforehand.\* While the Psalms and Hymns are being learned, the Antiphons will of course be in abeyance as far as the singers are concerned, and will be sung simply by the Priest and assistants. After this they will be easily taught to the boys, since they will be found to consist of melodies easy in themselves, and often repeated. Last of all will follow the teaching of the people to sing in alternate verses.

There is another mode of reconciling, or rather combining, the two departments of Choir and Congregational singing, which is worth mentioning in this place, and which we believe has been tried with complete success. This is by adopting the plan of *alternate* performance. Suppose, *e.g.*, the Psalms, Hymns, Magnificat, &c., are sung thus—one verse by the boys in the choir, the other verse by the men of the choir, joined by the whole congregation; or, again, the choir

---

\* Such is the plan generally adopted in the diocese of Rouen, as we find by a popular office-book, prepared by authority of the Archbishop, and used in the schools.

in two divisions, and the congregation, also divided, might sing alternately. The former plan, however, gives more security, as the voices of the choir-men are of great use in guiding the congregation. So, too, where unison music is adopted for the Mass, the same mode of alternating the clauses may be adopted. In fact, a skilful choir-master, aided by a tasteful accompanist, can easily devise many agreeable and varied ways of performing even the simplest music, so as to produce an effect little, if at all, less attractive than the more pretentious class of figured music, and certainly far preferable to that music indifferently done.

We have been obliged to occupy two articles in the task which we originally proposed. The subject indeed is an extensive one, and we are aware how inadequately at last we have been able to treat it. Indeed many points, which we have been able to do little more than allude to, would each furnish materials for a separate paper. This necessity of compression has doubtless, too, given a somewhat dry and uninteresting character to our remarks. We trust, however, that we have at least been able to furnish some practical suggestions, which may prove worthy of consideration by our musical readers, and which may tend to promote unity of feeling and action among those who are labouring in the important field we have traversed. We may add that we have been careful not so much to express individual opinions, as to follow the guidance of a *consensus* of wise and thoughtful persons who have made these subjects their study. Above all, we have striven to ascertain the mind of the Church on the various points under discussion. And if it be true, as one of the greatest of Popes\* has said, that "*there is no greater sign of the neglect of religion than the careless performance of the offices of the Church,*" we shall have done some service if we have in any way helped to bring about a musical celebration of these offices in a manner befitting their high and sacred character, and in a way suited to the wants of the Church in our own time and country.

We concluded our October article concerning this subject, by expressing our agreement with Canon Oakeley's letter in the "*Month*," which appeared in the same number. It is only fair therefore on the present occasion to quote the following satisfactory explanation which appeared in the November number of that periodical:—

---

\* Benedict XIV.

Having said thus much with regard to the attacks which our notice of September has elicited, we may be allowed to add a few words of simple explanation on a far more important point. Our readers will readily believe that our remarks were written under the impression that the practical question—as to the possibility of attaining success in the training of school-boys to perform our present Church music—was perfectly open, and had not been ruled one way or the other by any ecclesiastical authority. Under that impression alone could we have ventured to enter on the discussion; and even under that impression we did so with reluctance, and only with the hope of drawing attention to considerations which appeared to us to have been neglected by former writers. Our readers may also be aware that, in the course of last spring, his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster wrote a short letter to one of those who had taken part in the discussion, in which he warmly approved of the line of argument adopted, and the suggestions made, by that writer. We feel bound to say, that, although some passages of the Archbishop's letter were present to our mind at the time of writing, still we did not remember that his Grace had added to the expression of his opinion, that any sudden change in the choirs of our churches would be unadvisable, the further intimation of a very strong desire to see female singers excluded. "The tradition of the Church," his Grace remarked, "excluding women from choirs is so universal and inflexible that it is not easy to understand how it should have been so widely forgotten in this country. I can only conceive that the confusion of all things under the penal laws, the shattered and informal state of the Church in England after its emancipation,—our poverty—not only of money—but of culture to do better, and finally, the force of custom in rendering us insensible to many anomalies, have been the real causes of our ever admitting, and of our so long passively tolerating, so visible a deviation from the tradition and mind of the Church." His Grace adds, "A sudden order to remove women singers, while as yet we have no boys trained to take their place, would be inconvenient and inconsiderate. I have not thought it right to issue any such order. But all that I can effect by the strongest expression of desire and persuasion, I shall endeavour to effect." Again, "A little time and care will rear in every school a sufficient number of boys; and I trust that we shall before long have a proper and efficient choir in every church." These words of the Archbishop's are more than enough to make us regret having unintentionally—and, indeed, with a directly contrary intention—put ourselves, so far, in opposition to an authority to which we are always glad to bow with perfect and hearty obedience.

We conclude our contribution to the discussion by remarking, that as we have ventured to justify, against what seemed to us undutiful attacks, the tolerance which the Church has hitherto practised in the matter in question, so we are the last to deny the clear obligation of the decree of the Synod of Oscott, or to desire to see the slightest delay in its execution when that delay cannot be justified by grave inconvenience.

## ART. VII.—THE ORTHODOXY OF POPE HONORIUS.

*The Condemnation of Pope Honorius.* By P. LE PAGE RENOUF. London : Longmans.

*Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History.* By the Rev. PAUL BOTTALLA, S.J. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

IT has sometimes been said that this or that book fulfils the end of its existence, by eliciting some complete and unanswerable reply, and then subsiding into oblivion. We account this to be the case with Mr. Renouf's assault on the orthodoxy of Pope Honorius. After F. Bottalla's answer, nothing more, we think remains to be said. Never was anything more complete and exhaustive. Mr. Renouf's incidental statements indeed, concerning infallibility, are avowedly reserved by F. Bottalla for his future volume on that general subject; but we do not think that there is one single remark made by Mr. Renouf against Honorius's orthodoxy, which is not directly met in the pamphlet before us. It is the more likely to be final, because the author fully accepts as genuine existing documents (p. 141), and his argument therefore in no respect depends on uncertain questions of criticism and philology. For ourselves, we have already once brought the case of Honorius before our readers; viz. last July, soon after the appearance of Mr. Renouf's pamphlet. In reviewing however F. Bottalla's labours, we will avoid, as far as possible, all repetition of what we have already said, and make our second article supplementary to our first.

In regard to Honorius's connection with Monothelism, there are two distinct questions to be considered: first, did he teach heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*? and secondly, was he himself polluted by any taint of heresy? It is only the first of these two questions which concerns Ultramontanes as such. They only allege, that no Pope is permitted by the Holy Spirit to teach heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*; and even were it true therefore that Honorius was a heretic, his heresy would not in itself even *tend* to disprove their doctrine. But in fact no assertion can be made more monstrously and more demonstratively false, than that Honorius had so much as the faintest leaning to Monothelism. And as it is a very important fact indeed that no Pope has hitherto fallen into heresy, no treatment of the Honorius controversy will content

a true Catholic, which does not vindicate that Pope's personal orthodoxy. Moreover, there are the claims of reverence and gratitude due to an illustrious Pontiff; claims peculiarly imperative, as F. Bottalla well points out (p. 138), on the Catholics of England. To Honorius's "paternal endeavours" indeed (p. 140), "after Gregory the Great, England is indebted for its conversion to Christianity."\*

In the first place however we will consider the more vital question of the two; viz., whether Honorius taught heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*. Mr. Renouf indeed has so inextricably mixed up the two different issues, that we must ourselves look through his pages, for the purpose of discovering which arguments are intended for one and which for the other.

Mr. Renouf's first proposition then is, that Honorius taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*. And his first argument for this proposition is taken from the condemnatory sentence of various Popes and Councils. This argument is so wild, that we really think the author would not have alleged it, had he seen clearly in his mind the distinction between the two above-mentioned issues. Whoever reads carefully the language on which Mr. Renouf relies, even as he himself adduces it, will be irresistibly convinced that no such notion even occurred to the imagination either of Popes or Councils, as that of Honorius having taught Monothelism *ex cathedrâ*. Even as to the Eastern bishops of the Sixth Council, the strongest view which could possibly be taken of their unfavourableness to Honorius would be, that they declared him a heretic in the same sense in which they so declared Sergius, Cyrus, and the rest. But such censure is in a totally heterogeneous sphere, from any which would condemn him of having taught heresy *ex cathedrâ*.

F. Bottalla adduces a reply on this head which—though no reply is needed to such an argument as Mr. Renouf's—yet is not only conclusive in itself, but has a far wider range of importance than the particular controversy before us. If any inquirer desires to know the true relation which exists between Pope and Council, the one source of information which would most readily occur to him must be their respective demeanour when a Council assembles. No single instance can be named, in which any Pope has so spoken to a Council,

---

\* The various triumphs of Honorius's Pontificate are well recounted by F. Bottalla's reviewer in the "Tablet" of Nov. 28. He speaks of Honorius's "successful exertions to make England Catholic, and Rome more than ever a city of perfect beauty"; and mentions also that the same Pope, "had brought to a happy conclusion the seventy years' schism of the Three Chapters in the churches of Istria, and another which had lasted so long in Scotland and Ireland concerning the time of celebrating Easter."

as to imply that its decision could add anything whatever to the irreformableness of a Pontifical judgment already pronounced. In many cases indeed, the Pope *begins* by laying down the law, enunciating the necessary decision, and requiring the assembled bishops to confirm it. Whenever this claim is put forth, you never find them protest against it as a tyranny or usurpation; on the contrary, they invariably take it as a matter of course. The Sixth Council affords a conspicuous instance of this. Pope S. Agatho, in addressing the bishops,

sets before them the formula of Catholic faith, which is the formula of the Apostolic Magisterium of the Roman See; and he informs them they must believe and confess it, and, on the other hand, condemn and reject every dogma contrary to it. Should they refuse to submit to this rule of faith, they would be in error, in schism, and reprobation. But he could not impose a formula of faith to be believed and confessed, unless his Magisterium was universally acknowledged as infallible. Therefore he *repeatedly insists on that capital point of doctrine*. He declares that the Roman See *has never erred, and that it never shall err*. He confirms and explains his assertion, by referring to the promises of Christ, to the example of all the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and of the Œcumenical Synods themselves, which *had always received from Rome the paradigm of the doctrine they were to define*.—(pp. 89, 90.)

And now let us see how the assembled Fathers received his two Letters. Did they lift up their voice in protest against the fundamental doctrine of infallibility, which Agatho attributed to his See, and which he rested on the promises of Christ Himself? Was objection raised to the magisterial tone of the letters addressed to an Œcumenical Council? That large and influential assembly of bishops not only found nothing to censure in the letters of the Pope, but it received them as a whole and in all their parts as if they had been written by S. Peter, or rather by God Himself. The Fathers *testified to their admitting the infallible and divine authority of the Letters*, in the eighth session, as well as in the Synodical Letter addressed to Agatho; and *in the Prosphonic Letter sent to the Emperor they regarded them as a rule of faith*. No sooner did a suspicion arise that four bishops and two monks refused to adhere to them, than the Council ordered them to give an explanation of their faith in writing and on oath. They submitted, and solemnly affirmed that they accepted without reserve all the heads of doctrine contained in the Letters. Again Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, was, by sentence of the Council, deposed from his dignity and expelled from the Synod, because he refused to adhere to the letters of Agatho.—(pp. 90-92.)

Mr. Renouf at all events is not ignorant of logic. He will not maintain, on reflection, that the bishops first took for granted the infallibility of *all* Popes in *all* their *ex cathedrâ* decrees, and then proceeded to condemn of heresy one particular *ex cathedrâ* decree of one particular Pope.



Ultramontanes indeed generally allege, that all good Catholics at that time believed, more or less explicitly and consistently, in Papal infallibility. To this common allegation Mr. Renouf makes a reply, which is worth noticing, because it indicates another serious error into which he has fallen. He fancies that the Church teaches nothing as *of faith*, except that which she may have expressly *defined*. In his well-known Munich Brief, Pius IX. thus reproves this error :—"Even if the question concerned," he says, "that subjection of intellect which is to be yielded in an act of *divine faith*, yet such subjection ought not to have been limited to those things which have been hitherto defined by express decrees of Ecumenical Councils or of Roman Pontiffs and this Apostolic See, but extended to those things also which are delivered as divinely revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church dispersed through the world." Now the dogma that Christ has a human will and a human principle of operation, was taught by the Church as of faith from the very first. Yet Mr. Renouf argues that S. Sophronius and S. Maximus did not believe Papal infallibility, because they would not express their readiness to abandon that dogma at the Pope's bidding. F. Bottalla's remarks on this are so admirably expressed and so practically important, that we will give the whole passage :—

There are two kinds of cases in which doctrines may be said to be defined by the Pope. One regards doctrines which are not contained in a clear manner in the universal magisterium of the Church, and which are disputed on both sides ; as was for several centuries the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, with many others. The second concerns doctrines clearly revealed and universally believed as dogmas of faith, although they have never been defined explicitly and under anathema by the authentic magisterium. Such was the doctrine of the Consubstantiality of the Divine Word, and generally all the doctrines concerning the Incarnation.\* Now, the denial of a doctrine of the first class, before its infallible definition, does not constitute a sin of heresy : and if either of the two rival schools seek the supreme judgment of the Pope upon the question, it must be prepared to submit to that judgment, and be ready to reject the doctrine till then defended, and even to embrace the contrary teaching were it proposed by the Pope *ex cathedrâ*. But it is not so with doctrines of the other kind. A doctrine universally believed in the Church is infallibly *de fide* ; the consent of the Church being equivalent to a formal and explicit definition. Therefore the Arians, the Nestorians, and the Eutychians *were generally looked upon by the Catholics as heretics*,

---

\* It will be seen that F. Bottalla here draws the same distinction which we drew in our last number (p. 547), in reference to a certain argument urged against Mr. Liddon.

*even before any infallible sentence had been pronounced against them. In such cases, when a definition is required either from the Pope or from an Ecumenical Council, the request is made not properly for the instruction of the orthodox as to what they should believe in the matter, but only to crush and destroy error with the overwhelming authority of a supreme judgment. As to Catholics, those who, from ignorance or prejudice, have been led into error, are bound to wait for the infallible decree, and must hold themselves in readiness to submit unreservedly to the same ; but others, who are fully acquainted with the teaching of the Church, must be steady in their adhesion to it, while expecting that infallible decision which will finally confirm their faith. For the divine truth proposed in a decree of faith cannot possibly differ from the divine truth believed in the Universal Church. Consequently in such cases, when Catholics, already in possession of the Catholic truth, apply to the Pope or a General Council for a definition necessary to ensure the triumph of the Faith over heresy, they should not harbour in their heart the smallest doubt concerning the doctrine laid before the Apostolic See. Much less should they say, as Mr. Renouf would have them do, that they will change their opinion if the Pope decides the other way !—(pp. 42, 43.)*

We are still engaged with Mr. Renouf's first proposition, that Honorius taught heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*. We pass to his second argument for this proposition. It is plain, he considers, from intrinsic evidence and contemporary circumstances, (1) that the Pope's Letters to Sergius express Monothelism ; and (2) that the doctrine of those Letters was imposed on the Church by their writer, in his capacity of Universal Teacher. There are hardly any facts in history more certain, than are the contradictories of these two allegations. It will be more convenient however if we defer to the later part of our article our argument against the former. Here therefore we will only maintain—which is amply sufficient for the issue now before us—that Honorius's Letters to Sergius were not put forth *ex cathedrâ* at all. This particular part of the subject has been so exhausted by previous writers such as Orsi and Mazzarelli, that very little is left for F. Bottalla (as very little was left for ourselves in July) except to repeat their arguments. This however he does with great force and perspicuity. Thus first as to the *extrinsic* proof that Honorius was not speaking as Universal Teacher :—

According to the discipline and practice of the Church in ancient times, which was preserved for many centuries, there are some solemnities which were ordinarily observed when dogmatic constitutions were despatched by Roman Pontiffs. They were previously read and examined in the synod of the bishops of Italy, with whom the prelates of neighbouring provinces were sometimes associated ; or in the assembly of the clergy of the Roman Church. Again, they were sent to the patriarchs, or even to the primates and metropolitans, that they might be everywhere known and obeyed. Finally, the

signatures of all the bishops were often required to those papal constitutions, to show their submission and adhesion to them. We do not now mean to spend time in demonstrating these points of ancient ecclesiastical discipline ; they will be found proved beyond all question in the learned works of Coustant, Thomassin, and Cardinal Orsi. It must be distinctly understood that we do not maintain the absolute necessity of the above-mentioned characters, as if no Papal utterance of that age could be *ex cathedrâ* if any one of these marks were wanting ; but we maintain affirmatively, that Papal utterances bearing all these characters were to be regarded as certainly issued *ex cathedrâ* ; and negatively, that no Papal decree could be considered at that time as *ex cathedrâ*, if wanting in all and each of those characters.—(pp. 18, 19.)

Secondly, as to the *intrinsic* proof that the Letters to Sergius were not *ex cathedrâ*. On this point it seems to us that our author speaks more consistently and intelligibly, than most of his predecessors. For these, in their desire to rid themselves of responsibility for such utterances as Honorius's, have often laid down tests of an *ex cathedrâ* Act, which in their obvious sense would equally exclude S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter and many other such documents. Nowhere have we seen the thing better expressed than by F. Bottalla :—

In order that a Papal utterance may have the character of a teaching *ex cathedrâ*, it is requisite first, not only that it should treat of a question of faith, but that it should *propose a doctrine to be believed or condemned* ; secondly, that the Pope should show the intention of teaching as Pope, and of enforcing his doctrinal decrees on the Universal Church. If either of these two qualities be wanting, the letter cannot be said to contain any teaching *ex cathedrâ*. This is what all Catholics, without exception, admit as necessary and essential to an infallible document issued by Papal authority.—(p. 18.)

But what *doctrine* can Mr. Renouf even allege, as having been proposed in either of Honorius's Letters? Why, the Pontiff declared again and again that he intended to define no doctrine at all ; but, on the contrary, as F. Bottalla well expresses it (p. 31), to “ quiet the controversy by an economy of silence.” In July we drew out this argument at length (pp. 213, 4), and shall here therefore say no more on the subject.

Mr. Renouf indeed argues (p. 20) that S. Sophronius had expressly applied for an *ex cathedrâ* judgment, and that Honorius's first Letter was a *reply* to that application. Now even if he had applied for such a judgment, it would be monstrous to infer from that circumstance that the Pontiff thought fit to give one. But F. Bottalla conclusively shows (pp. 36-41) that Mr. Renouf has confused two totally different embassies,

sent by S. Sophronius to Rome; and that the one sent through Stephen of Dora, to which Mr. Renouf refers, did not reach Rome until after Honorius's death. Indeed, F. Bottalla (p. 40) retorts S. Sophronius's authority against Mr. Renouf. For it was *after* Honorius's first Letter to Sergius had been received, that S. Sophronius solemnly declared that "the foundations of orthodox doctrine rest on the Apostolic See." Most certainly then he did not think that Honorius's response had committed the Apostolic See to any unorthodox doctrine.

Through the whole range of controversy then there can hardly be found a more certain fact, than that which by itself abundantly suffices for the Ultramontane argument: we mean the fact, that Honorius did not teach heresy or error *ex cathedrâ*. But in real truth there is no shadow of pretext for alleging, that he was personally infected with the heretical leaven at all. We are here to examine Mr. Renouf's arguments against this position; while in the course of doing so, we trust to show that the position itself is absolutely impregnable.

We will first consider the only one of these arguments, which possesses even any colourable or superficial plausibility; viz. that derived from the language of the Sixth Council, and again of the Eighth. Now Mr. Renouf is arguing, not of course against Gallicans, but against Ultramontanes; and Ultramontanes hold that no doctrinal decree of a Council is infallible, except so far as, and in the sense wherein, a Pope may confirm it. It is interesting doubtless, as a point of history, to consider what the bishops assembled at Constantinople intended to declare; but the only inquiry of doctrinal importance is, which of their decrees received Pontifical confirmation and in what sense.

We will begin with the otiose historical question. What did the bishops intend to declare? As we said in our former article, we think it more probable that in some of their statements they intended to accuse Honorius of heresy. F. Bottalla adopts a conclusion less discreditable to them. "No one of them," he considers (p. 97), "believed that the Pope held the impious doctrines which were execrated." "In the decree" of the 13th Session "Honorius was not condemned for any heretical tenet" (p. 107). Still he thinks (*ib.*) that there was "a Greek faction in the Sixth Synod, which it was impossible to keep in thorough control;" and which not improbably "contrived to vent all its bitterness against Honorius in the final synodical exclamations:" though he denies that this faction prevailed in the previous decrees. Nay even as to the decrees, he recognizes and "strongly denounces" "the exaggeration

and bitterness of expression" which they display (p. 108): due, as he thinks, "to a strong faction which exercised its influence in that Council and *carried the day*." It is with great diffidence that on any question of ecclesiastical history, however comparatively insignificant, we differ from F. Bottalla; but we still think the other view more probable. We think it more probable, that the majority of bishops intended, in their decrees no less than in their acclamations, to declare Honorius heretical; though they were careful to insert no such expression in their definition. This latter of course they did not attempt; for they well knew how hopeless it would be to expect Pontifical confirmation of any such sentence.

We will not however argue this little point with F. Bottalla. Nor indeed should we have referred again to the question at all, were it not for the great importance of making perfectly clear to Mr. Renouf and his sympathizers, that it is one of no controversial importance whatever, and one freely debated among Ultramontanes themselves.

There is nothing then about the Sixth Council which concerns our argument, except S. Leo's confirmation thereof. Now S. Leo II.'s infallible judgment contained two different portions: he confirmed a certain declaration of the Council, and he added a certain elucidation of his own. What was that declaration of the Council? Exclusively the *definition*. F. Bottalla proves this with irrefragable cogency from p. 108 to p. 110. In addition to the testimonies for this conclusion which we cited in July (pp. 219, 220), he mentions that the bishops themselves, in petitioning the Emperor to acquaint the patriarchal sees with what had been done, requested him only to send to those sees an authentic copy of the *definition*.

It has sometimes been urged indeed, that S. Leo, by not expressing any *disapproval* of the Acts when he received them, implied assent to every single portion of their contents. We cannot for a moment acquiesce in such reasoning. We have more than once had occasion to comment on the inexpressibly difficult task, which in each successive century devolves on the Holy Father. He must not permit anything which shall compromise the Truth; yet, on the other hand, he must so defend the Truth, that there may be the smallest possible dissension among Catholics, and that unstable minds may be exposed to the smallest possible temptation towards rebellion and schism. It was in this critical and most anxious navigation between Scylla and Charybdis, that Honorius himself made the one mistake of his otherwise illustrious Pontificate. And the ties between East and West were even looser in the time of S.

Leo II. than they had been in those of his predecessor. One only question have men any right to ask. Did S. Leo speak with sufficient explicitness in his official Letter, to make clear in what sense he consented to Honorius's anathematization? This he certainly did. It would have been wrong to say less; but under then circumstances it would probably have also been wrong to say one iota more.

What is said then concerning Honorius in the definition strictly so called? Nothing which implies ever so remotely that Honorius held, or tended to hold, the Monothelite heresy. "The devil," it is declared, "had found suitable instruments for his design" of promoting Monothelism, and Honorius was one of them. But even had its wording been doubtful, S. Leo's own statement is the one decisive and authentic authority, as to the sense in which Catholics are to receive that definition. Now S. Leo not only does not class Honorius with the heretics, but draws the most express distinction between him and them: as F. Bottalla points out in pp. 110-113. He anathematizes "the inventors of the new error;" and *also* Honorius, who "*permitted*" the immaculate to be "defiled."\*

And the meaning of these words he still more clearly explained in his Letter to the Spanish bishops, where he says that Honorius's offence was his having fostered the heresy by neglect, instead of repressing it at the outset. Indeed, as we argued in July (p. 221), S. Leo's language not only does not *condemn* Honorius of heresy: it emphatically

---

\* "Τῇ βεβήλῳ προδοσίᾳ μινθῆναι τὴν ἄσπιλον παρεχώρησε." F. Bottalla translates this "permitted the immaculate to be polluted by profane betrayal;" so that "profane betrayal" shall be ascribed, not to Honorius, but to the Monothelites. We quite agree with him (p. 112) that "the Greek text easily and without the slightest strain yields" this sense, and that in every respect this sense is preferable to the other. And in a letter to the "Tablet" of December 12, he adduces a strong confirmation of his view from S. Leo's context: for the very word "betrayal" suggests a remembrance of what S. Leo had said just before; viz., that certain successive patriarchs of Constantinople had been "ὑποκαθιστὰς" "traitors lying in ambush." At the same time the importance of F. Bottalla's amendment rather consists, we think, in greatly softening the *tone* of S. Leo's language about Honorius, than in affecting its *substance*. We are obliged to say this in self-defence, because in our former article we acquiesced in the other interpretation. Whichever of the two be taken, our argument in the text equally proves, that S. Leo's words are conclusive for his belief in Honorius's perfect orthodoxy. And when the divinely appointed guardian of the Faith culpably permits the growth of deadly heresy, it seems to us quite intelligible that such neglect should be characterized as a "profane betrayal" of his duty. At the same time of Bottalla has quite convinced us that S. Leo did *not* apply the phrase to Honorius's conduct.



*acquits* him of that charge. Let us take a parallel case. A mutiny arises in some regiment, and the Colonel is accused before a Court Martial of being concerned in it. The Court pronounces that Captains A and B, Lieutenants C, D, and E, &c. &c., were concerned in the mutiny; nay, and that the Colonel himself did not, as was his duty, detect it at its beginning and promptly put it down; but on the contrary, by his neglect fostered its growth, and permitted the loyalty of the regiment to be stained. No one of common sense would understand their verdict otherwise, than as condemning the Colonel indeed of very culpable neglect, but acquitting him of all sympathy with the mutiny. Had Honorius been himself disposed to Monothelism, his *neglect*—instead of being a calamity—would have been the best thing for the Church which under circumstances could happen.

Now lastly, how much is involved in the sentence of anathema passed upon Honorius by S. Leo II.? F. Bottalla is careful to answer this question:—

It implies nothing but that his name was to be erased from the diptychs, and his likeness from the pictures in the churches; because it was customary, especially from the beginning of the seventh century, for the names of all orthodox Bishops to be inserted in the diptychs, and their portraits exposed in the churches. Now Anastasius relates that, after the sentence of the Sixth Synod, the names of Sergius, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter were expunged from the diptychs, and the pictures of them destroyed; but he does not say anything of the name of Honorius having been erased, or of his images being removed from the churches or effaced. His name undeniably is found in the Oriental diptychs, and we still have the laudatory notices which accompanied his name. All things tend to corroborate the view, that the severe sentence pronounced by the Sixth Synod against that Pope was tempered in its execution, because he had not been condemned for heresy. —(pp. 135, 6.)

In regard to the Eighth Council, we spoke of its definition in July (pp. 222, 3). Over and above what we there said, we would refer our readers to F. Bottalla's excellent remarks in pp. 132-4. But we must not go a second time over the same ground.

To sum up. Mr. Renouf maintains that Honorius was condemned as a Monothelite heretic. We rather incline to think, that the majority of the bishops of the Sixth Council did consider and declare him heretical. But their *definition*, at all events, contains no trace of this, and S. Leo II. only confirmed their definition. Moreover, in the very act of confirming this definition, he pronounced expressly, or at least by most manifest and undeniable implication, his predecessor's

*innocence* of heresy. He anathematized Honorius, not for heresy, but for what may be called misprision of heresy.

We are encountering Mr. Renouf's second proposition; viz., that Honorius was personally imbued with Monothelism. And we have now considered what, as we observed, is the only argument of his, which possesses even superficial plausibility. He also, however, infers Honorius's unorthodoxy, from the whole series of events which elapsed, between the writing of that Pontiff's Letters and the Sixth Council. This part of his argument we totally omitted to consider in July; but F. Bottalla gives it a crushing reply in every particular.

Mr. Renouf then argues (1) that Sergius regarded the Pope as assenting to his own Monothelite doctrine. But F. Bottalla answers (p. 33), that if the heretical patriarch had really so thought, it is most unaccountable why he gave the Pontifical Letters no publicity. Yet he "was anxious rather to withdraw them from view and bury them in the archives of the Church of Constantinople; where they were found in their Latin autograph, accompanied by a Greek version, at the time of the Sixth Council. Pyrrhus also, the successor of Sergius, does not appear to have published them; but only to have put in circulation a small extract from the first of them, which admitted of being misconstrued in an heretical meaning" (pp. 33, 4).

Then (2) great stress has been laid by orthodox writers on three distinct and independent contemporary witnesses of Honorius's orthodoxy: Abbot John, Pope John IV., and S. Maximus. Mr. Renouf replies (p. 15) that their evidence is "really that of one man, and that one an interested and mendacious witness:" or, as he puts it more amiably in a letter to the "Westminster Gazette," that Abbot John was "an interested liar." F. Bottalla pays Mr. Renouf off in his own coin; and tells him roundly that his "passage is one tissue of impudent assertion, suppression of truth, and blundering error." Let us look at the facts.

Abbot John was Honorius's secretary; and in that capacity wrote the very Letter which has been chiefly called into question. He testifies that it denied the existence in Christ, not of a human will, but of two distinct and contrary human wills. Mr. Renouf replies to him in effect, what Dr. Johnson on one occasion said outright: "Sir, you lie, and you know you lie." And this to one who, as F. Bottalla points out (p. 62), was declared by S. Maximus "a most holy man"!

Abbot John spoke from personal knowledge; while Pope John and S. Maximus argue from the contents themselves of the Letter. But all three distinctly and independently

witness the tradition of Honorius's orthodoxy, which prevailed in their time; and (as F. Bottalla observes in p. 65) "each of them pledged his own credit in the defence of Honorius which they put forward." Again, Mr. Renouf speaks (p. 15) as though S. Maximus said nothing in the Pontiff's behalf, beyond appealing to Abbot John's testimony; whereas F. Bottalla mentions (pp. 62, 3) that in his epistle to Marinus the Saint fully examines Honorius's Letter, and argues for its orthodoxy from its own internal evidence. Nay in that epistle (Bottalla, p. 73) "he represents Honorius as not only unstained with Monothelism, but also as one of the most zealous Pontiffs who resisted that heresy."

Mr. Renouf thus argues (3): "the fact that Pope Martin I. and the Lateran Council heard Honorius quoted in a dogmatic letter as an authority for Monothelism without any contradiction being offered, is a sure sign that his cause was no longer held to be defensible" (p. 17). But (Bottalla, p. 75) that very Pope, on opening that very Council, declared that his predecessors had most constantly resisted Monothelism. It is the oddest possible reasoning, to argue from his *silence* on one occasion, that he had *spoken* mendaciously on another. Two further replies are also given by F. Bottalla. It was not only Honorius's Letter, he urges, which the Fathers heard alleged for heresy without contradiction. They "heard without any contradiction the names of S. Gregory, S. Cyril, S. Athanasius, and the rest, quoted as authorities for Monothelism; and yet no one believes this to be a sure sign that the cause of these holy Doctors was no longer held to be defensible" (p. 78). But in truth Honorius's heterodoxy was by implication denied throughout the Lateran Council.

In the course of the Council itself many *Libelli* were read, all concerning the Monothelite controversy. . . . *In all these Libelli and Synodical Letters the Roman See is spoken of as the foundation of faith, as the teacher of truth, as the centre of Catholic doctrine:* in all of them the four patriarchs are unanimously denounced, together with other partisans and promoters of the new heresy. *But we find no allusion, direct or indirect, to Pope Honorius.* This omission cannot be explained, except by supposing that no one considered the doctrine of Honorius deserving of such denunciation. We must not, then, follow Mr. Renouf in believing that at the time of the Lateran Council the cause of Honorius was held to be no longer defensible; on the contrary, it was then considered that no plausible ground could be found for any charge of heresy against him.—(pp. 79, 80.)

Mr. Renouf (4) speaks disparagingly (p. 15) on "the *negat*-testimony of Pope Agatho." But we showed in our

former article (p. 218) that S. Agatho's "testimony" was by no means "negative;" that he characterized Honorius as a man "thoroughly instructed in the Lord's doctrine."

Mr. Renouf's statement (5) will have been observed, that so early as S. Martin I.'s time Honorius's cause was no longer considered at Rome to be defensible. In p. 13 he speaks more distinctly. "His own Church first defended him, then maintained an ominous silence about him, and finally joined in his condemnation." F. Bottalla (p. 74) cites Dr. Döllinger's parallel assertion, that Honorius was "abandoned by all" at Rome, because of his Monothelism. But how is all this consistent, asks F. Bottalla, with the epigraph engraven on his sepulchre, in which he was described as a worthy successor to S. Gregory, both in doctrine and virtue? How is it consistent with the undeviating testimony of Honorius's successors, from John IV. to S. Agatho?

Nor is there indeed any appearance whatever—but much the contrary—that any predecessor of S. Leo II. considered Honorius to have injured the orthodox cause by his unwise discipline of silence. We ascribed this change of Roman view, in our former article (p. 222), to the information from the East which S. Leo must have received on return of the Legates. At the same time we need hardly say, that S. Leo's solemn judgment on a dogmatical fact must be humbly accepted as infallibly true; and that no Catholic, since that judgment, has been at liberty to doubt the existence of this one drawback, from the merits of a Pontificate otherwise so glorious.

We now come finally to what must be considered at last the one most satisfactory appeal on this issue; viz., the actual content of Honorius's Letters. This question we expressly deferred in our former article (p. 224) to a future occasion; and by discussing it, we answer the only further argument of Mr. Renouf's which remains to be considered.

F. Bottalla has expressed in a few pages (7-16) with such masterly clearness and completeness the Monothelite tenet, that nothing remains for us so far, except briefly to place his view in our own way before our readers. Among all the ramifications of Eutychianism, Monothelism seems on its surface the least unintelligible. It was the fundamental notion of Eutyches, that Christ's two natures are blended and mixed up together by their union in God the Son; but when the question was asked him what is the "tertium quid" which results from this intermixture, he was baffled. Now Monothelism gives an intelligible account of itself; and it has

moreover the advantage of retaining the Catholic phraseology, on Christ's existence "*in two natures.*" We hope we shall not be thought irreverent if, for the sake of illustrating this Monothelite doctrine, we avail ourselves of a well-known Eastern story. Its hero shall be its narrator:—

"I was endowed by this beneficent genius with a singular power of deserting my own body when I pleased, and shooting my soul into the body of any dead animal I might meet. My first experience of this power was with the body of a magnificent stag, which had just died from breathless exhaustion in running. Immediately its body—now my body—rose into life, and I gazed with complacency on the beautiful form reflected in a neighbouring brook. Soon however the hunter's horn sounded at a distance. My cervine nature at once experienced a keen emotion of deadly fear, while my human nature at the same moment experienced an emotion of wonder at that fear. Speedily however my reason told me that danger was near at hand; and my feet, set in motion by command of my will, carried me off at a speed to me astonishing, till they placed me in a safe spot."

Here appears on the surface a true case of one person in two natures. The narrator says, "*I experienced at once a cervine emotion of fear, and a human emotion of wonder at that fear.*" We cannot be surprised, in the parallel case, that Monothelites sincerely believed themselves to hold the dogma of "*two natures.*" But a little consideration of the fable will show that (without speaking of the human nature) the cervine nature at all events was not possessed in its integrity, but on the contrary was destitute of its principal element. There was no cervine *principle of operation*. The immediate cause, which set in motion the narrator's cervine legs, was his *human will*. The fable therefore affords a true analogy to the Monothelite tenet. According to that tenet, there is in Christ no human principle of action, no human will; but all things done by the sacred humanity are caused immediately by command of the divine will.

Now it would carry us much too far, if we attempted to give any sufficient account of the frightful results which issue logically from Monothelism. But it is important, even for our present purpose, to touch the matter superficially; and we will briefly indicate therefore two of these results.

Firstly there is no more vital dogma of the Faith, we need not say, than that the acts and words of Jesus Christ are the acts and words of God the Son; and not in any proper sense the acts and words of God the Father, or God the Holy Ghost. This vital dogma is utterly overthrown by Monothelism. Let

us explain this statement ; and let us begin with contemplating *His words*.

Now we ask this preliminary question:—To what person are those words truly ascribed, which are uttered by human organs ? Of course to that person who has power over those organs, and who commands them to articulate those words. Read F. Surin's most interesting narrative about the Ursulines of Loudun. Some evil spirit possesses a certain nun, and compels her mouth to utter frightful blasphemies. *Whose words are these blasphemies ?* The nun's ? No one would dream of saying so ; they are the words of the evil spirit.

Consider then our Blessed Lord pronouncing, e.g., the Sermon on the Mount. Whose are those blessed words ? They are the words of Him who commands our Lord's vocal organs to articulate them. But according to the Monothelites, this command is issued by no will except the divine ; and every act of the divine will is common of course to the Three Divine Persons. According to Monothelism then, it is the Father no less truly and primarily than the Son, Who says, "Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit" ; "Not My will, but Thine be done" ; "The Father is greater than I" ; &c., &c. If Christian dogma really resulted in such an issue as this, it would of course be self-contradictory and self-condemned. And what we have said on Christ's *words*, applies with equal force to His *acts*.

Then, secondly, Jesus Christ came on earth, as for other reasons, so also very prominently for this ; that by practising human virtue, He "might leave us an example for us to follow His steps." We shall see subsequently the stress laid by Honorius on this doctrine. But human virtue consists exclusively in due regulation of the human will ; above all, in its absolute and unreserved submission to the divine will. The Monothelites then in effect denied that He gave us any example of human virtue whatever.

Our direct purpose, in mentioning these two results of the heresy, is to make clear the precise and most unmistakable distinction between Monothelism and orthodoxy. But we have been far from unwilling incidentally to show, that this distinction is no minute and subtle splitting of hairs—as misbelievers and indifferentists love to declare—but on the contrary among the deepest and widest distinctions which can possibly be imagined ; that the Monothelite heresy subverts Christianity from its very foundation.

Whoever would see a fuller explanation of the Monothelite tenet, and an exposition of its historical relations with Eutychianism, cannot do better (as we have already said) than



study carefully F. Bottalla's most instructive pages. For ourselves we thus briefly sum up. Catholics and Monothelites agree that Christ possesses, not only human sensations of the body, but human emotions of the soul. They differ, in that Monothelites will not ascribe to him any human *will*, any human *principle of operation*; whereas Catholics say that His human nature is in itself operative, its operative principle being His human will.

To our mind it is one of the most instructive facts in the world, as showing the absolute blindness which prejudice can superinduce, that persons have been found, who can read Honorius's Letters and suspect them of any the remotest tendency to Monothelism. We have no hesitation in saying, that they demonstrate him to have held the orthodox dogma as clearly and explicitly, as it was held by S. Sophronius, S. Maximus, S. Martin I., S. Agatho, or S. Leo II. We cannot of course say that he *expressed* that dogma quite so clearly as did those Saints; simply because he knew nothing about Monothelism, and did not therefore express orthodoxy with a direct view to the contradiction of that heresy. But even in the way of *expression*, we must maintain that his Letters are fully as complete and distinct as the renowned exposition of S. Leo I.; and indeed, as will presently appear, somewhat more so. So completely is this the case, that if other circumstances permitted one to consider the doctrinal portion of his Letters as having been put forth *ex cathedrâ*, there would be nothing in their *doctrine* to invest this supposition with any kind of improbability.

The Monothelite issue assumed different forms, as the controversy advanced through successive stages. At first the question asked was, "Are there in Christ two operations, or is there only one?": but latterly the question rather was, "Are there in Him two *wills*, or is there only one?" It is quite immaterial however, which of these questions you ask: for on both, Honorius's answer on the orthodox side is as clear as noonday light. We begin with the first. Did Honorius hold that there is in Christ a human principle of operation? In other words, did he hold that Christ's human nature—His human soul—is *operative*? Or, on the contrary, did he hold (with the Monothelites) that it is purely passive? We should be glad to see how Dr. Döllinger or Mr. Renouf could give a more simply unmistakable answer to this question, than does Honorius in his second Letter. "We ought to confess," he says, "two natures in Christ . . . *operating and principles of action*:" "ἐνεργούσας καὶ πρακτικὰς": "operantes atque operatrices." Again. "Let us preach," he says, "the two

natures . . . . each operating its own proper acts : ” “ τὰς δὲ φύσεις . . . . ἐνεργοῦσας τὰ ἴδια : ” “ duas naturas propria operantes. ” \*

So much on the human operation. But put the issue in its other shape. Did he hold that in Christ there is a human will? Turn to his first Letter. “ We profess,” he says, “ one will of our Lord Jesus Christ : because plainly our nature was assumed by the Godhead, not the sin in it ; that is, our nature as it was created before sin existed, not that which was corrupted after the transgression. ” The question to be here asked is most simple, and admits but of one possible reply. Is Honorius speaking in these words of Christ’s divine or human will? Mr. Renouf makes the astounding remark (p. 16) that “ the context of this passage ” proves its reference to the divine will. Can he be in his senses? Does he think, or did Honorius think, that Adam before the fall was a plant? a vegetable? at the utmost a brute? Was not Adam created in possession of a will? That which he was happy in not possessing, was a second will at variance with the first. Now Honorius’s distinct argument is this :—“ Since Christ assumed that human nature which existed before the fall, He has only one will, and not two. ” Yet Mr. Renouf will have it, and Dr. Döllinger will have it, that the will of which the Pontiff speaks is the divine. When should we have heard the last of it, if some unlucky Ultramontane had talked such nonsense? Judging indeed from his pamphlet, we cannot ascribe to Mr. Renouf any high order of ability ; and we are confident that Dr. Döllinger’s intellectual power has been egregiously overrated : but still neither of the two is an idiot. How can we account for so stupid a blunder, unless we ascribe it to the blinding force of prejudice?

Mr. Renouf, in desperation we suppose, attempts this argument :—“ If Honorius believed that the real question at issue ” concerned two human and contrary wills, “ he ought

\* There is a little misprint,—“ operantis instead of operantes,”—in F. Bottalla’s citation of this passage (p. 52), which would much lessen the force of his argument if it were not observed.

Mr. Renouf (p. 22) cites, almost entire, the fragment of Honorius’s second Letter from which these two quotations are derived ; and yet omits the former quotation, merely substituting marks of omission. This is pointed out by F. Bottalla. In our former article we mentioned (p. 214, note) that he ends his quotation in the midst of a sentence ; and that if he had inserted the two remaining lines, the complete fallaciousness of his argument would have been manifested. In October we had to complain (p. 450) that in quoting two sentences, as from S. Jerome, to prove the fall of S. Liberius, he omitted from one of them three words, which would have shown the sentences to be in flagrant mutual contradiction. All this is incredibly unfair.

to have condemned Sophronius for manifestly heretical doctrine" (p. 16). Never was there a more suicidal piece of reasoning. It is Mr. Renouf's very contention, that Honorius thoroughly agreed with Sergius; and Ultramontanes on their side (F. Bottalla is an instance) always admit, that he did thoroughly coincide with what he *understood* to be Sergius's mind. Did Sergius then represent S. Sophronius and himself as having been at issue, on the question of two human wills in Christ? It was not possible he could have ventured on such a calumny; which must at once indeed have aroused the Pope's suspicion, and overthrown Sergius's whole iniquitous design. The most cursory perusal of that Patriarch's letter will show, that he represented S. Sophronius and himself as absolutely united on every point of dogma, and as only having differed for a time (though not still differing) on the advisableness of a certain expression. In what Sergius said about two human and contrary wills, he was adducing an argument against the advisableness of the phrase "two operations." Such a phrase, he said, scandalizes many; (1) because it has not been used hitherto by Christian teachers, and (2) because a misunderstanding of it leads men to preach the impious tenet, of two human and contrary wills in the Incarnate God. Since Sergius then had expressly said that the phrase "two operations" was leading men to this impious doctrine, what could be more natural, than that the Pope should occupy a considerable portion of his Letter in denouncing the said doctrine?

In fact Honorius, thoroughly and explicitly versed though he was in Catholic dogma, had not the slightest or most rudimental knowledge of the Monothelite heresy, nor any suspicion whatever of Sergius's real drift. And we are thus able to understand the fault, for which he was afterwards anathematized. It was twofold. Sergius's letter was most carefully worded indeed, still it contained one or two expressions which were indubitably Monothelistic;\* yet these did not awaken the Pontiff's suspicion. Then secondly, even if Sergius had avoided every the slightest indication of his heresy, it was still Honorius's duty, not to take Sergius's statement of the case for granted, but to investigate through trustworthy persons the true theological phenomena of the East. He

---

\* For instance: "As our *body* is ordered and directed by our *intellectual and rational soul*, so also, in the case of our Lord Christ, His whole human composition was always . . . moved by God (θεοκίνητον)." "The divine nature truly operates the salvation of all, through the body *which clothes it* (τοῦ περὶ αὐτὴν σώματος), so that [His death] is the *suffering* indeed of the *flesh*, but the *operation of God* (τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐνέργειαν)." F. Bottalla gives an excellent analysis of Sergius's letter in pp. 50, 51.

failed to perform this duty, and by his failure brought down on the Church a heavy calamity.

But it will be more satisfactory and will greatly strengthen our case, if we proceed to give an analysis of the Pope's two Letters; and if we print them in extenso at the end of our article, that our readers may be the better able to judge on the correctness of our analysis. We will but premise, that they do not exist in the original Latin; but only in a Greek translation, and in a Latin translation of that translation. If therefore there is found in them occasional awkwardness or obscurity of expression, there is no reason whatever for thence inferring, that such awkwardness or obscurity is attributable to Honorius himself.

He begins his first Letter by praising Sergius warmly for vetoing a new theological term, "which might scandalize the more simple;" and he continues by declaring the dogma of the Incarnation, in terms which remind one forcibly of S. Leo's Dogmatic Letter. We must not however fail to point out that this exposition contains one clause, which is more express in the assertion of Duothelism than is any portion of S. Leo's. He speaks of Jesus Christ as "operating divine acts *through the mediation* of the sacred humanity," "ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεῖα μεσσιτευούσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος." These words cannot be explained at all satisfactorily, except by the Catholic dogma of two wills. The one illustration of Christ's *divine* acts, given both by S. Leo and by Honorius, is the working of miracles: Honorius therefore declares that Christ wrought miracles, "through the mediation of the sacred humanity." What sense could a Monothelite possibly affix to this phrase? He must say, we suppose, that it refers merely to that utterance of Christ's human organs, which in each case preceded a miracle: to His words, e.g., "Lazarus come forth," or "I will, be thou clean." Now firstly, this is a most meagre explanation of so strong and emphatic a phrase. But secondly and more importantly, in various cases there was *no* vocal utterance immediately preceding a miracle: as, e.g., when the ten lepers were cleansed on their way to the priest; or when S. Peter found a coin in the fish's mouth; or when our Lord miraculously multiplied bread. No explanation in the least satisfactory can be given of the Pope's teaching, except that which Catholic theology supplies; viz., that in each case Christ's human will echoed, if we may so express ourselves, the command of His divine will, and was the immediate agent of the miracle.

In his second paragraph Honorius inveighs against that detestable tenet of two human and contrary wills in Christ, which

he understood from Sergius to have been originated among some Easterns by the phrase "two operations." He prefaces his denunciation, by declaring that the Hypostatic Union took place, "the differences of each nature marvellously remaining" unchanged: language which, taken by itself, it is difficult or impossible to reconcile with a notion, that Christ's human nature had lost its operating principle by the union. Because of this ineffable conjunction between the two natures, he adds, on one hand God is said to have suffered; while on the other hand the sacred humanity (of which Honorius has already affirmed once, and presently affirms again, that it was assumed by Christ from the Most Holy Virgin) is said to have come down from heaven *with* the divine nature. *For which reason*, he adds, we profess that Christ's will is but one; because manifestly He took "that human nature which was created before the existence of sin." His argument is as follows. This common saying, that the sacred humanity came down from heaven, shows by itself that the humanity assumed was not that of Adam *fallen*, but of Adam *innocent*. It is true, as he goes on to say in his next sentences, that the Word was made *flesh*, and that the word "flesh" sometimes means in Scripture "the carnal mind:" as in three instances which he gives. But the word is *also* used in Scripture, he points out, to express "human nature" in general; and of this too he gives three instances. He then repeats emphatically, that in Christ there was no law of the members warring against the law of the spirit.

Here let us pause to consider this paragraph as far as it has gone; since some of Honorius's accusers have marvellously thought that it tells on their side. And firstly, as to the very phrase "one will." Let it be remembered, that the polemical phrase at issue in *Honorius's time* between Catholics and Monothelites did not speak of "one will" but "one operation." On the other hand, the phrase "one will" had been in use for centuries among the orthodox, in that very sense in which we maintain Honorius to have used it; viz., as expressing the absolute harmony between Christ's divine and human wills.\*

---

\* Thus F. Schneeman quotes a passage from S. Chrysostom's comment on John vi. 38, in which the Saint says that Christ willed what the Father willed; and that therefore there was not one will of the Father and another of Christ, but "manifestly *one will*." A still stronger passage has been shown the present writer by a friend, from S. Athenasius's treatise against Apollinaris, c. 2, s. 10. This passage indeed, in its particular *mode* of expressing a denial that in Christ there was any carnal will, would really appear on the surface to admit a Monothelistic interpretation, which most certainly no line of Honorius's Letters has the remotest appearance of admitting. Yet else-

That Honorius therefore should have so used the phrase, is just what might have been expected.

Next, as the argument of the paragraph. Honorius begins by declaring Christ's human nature to be so intimately united with His divine, that the former is commonly said to have come down from heaven with the latter. What inference does he draw from this premiss? "That the sacred humanity had no will," say his accusers: "that it had no *carnal* will," say his defenders. "In Christ there was but one will," says the Monothelite, "because all His human acts were immediately commanded by the divine will." "In Christ was perfect unity of will" says the orthodox believer, "because He took the will of Adam innocent." This latter statement involves of course a direct contradiction to the former; and it is Honorius's statement. "Therefore," says the Pontiff, "His will is one; for He took Adam's nature as it was before the fall." "It is true," Honorius proceeds, "that the Word was made *flesh*: but this last expression must not be understood as signifying the carnal will." This was the one thing in the Pontiff's mind, that Christ had no *carnal* will. It is really plain enough for a child to see, that the very notion of Christ having no human will *at all*, had never occurred to Honorius (as men say) in his very dreams. And to expound his words as asserting that heretical tenet, shows either that the expositor has not fairly given his mind to the matter, or else that he is utterly blinded by passion or prejudice.

Honorius next proceeds to notice the argument for two contrary wills, raised from such sayings of our Lord as "*non quod volo, sed quod Tu vis*;" and the like. As to these passages he says, "Οὐκ εἰσι ταῦτα διαφόρου θελήματος, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς προσληφθείσης." Here again his opponents try to make great controversial capital out of his sentence. But their interpretation of it is so simply monstrous, that we can imagine no excuse for them, except the undoubted fact that the sentence does not absolutely exhibit on the very surface its true explanation. Before we enter on its exposition, it will perhaps be more satisfactory if we make a short but (we trust) not uninteresting digression. We will consider then how Catholic theologians interpret those sayings of our Lord, to which Honorius refers. No one perhaps has explained the matter more fully and precisely, than Lugo.

We shall be able to set forth the Catholic doctrine more

---

where (de Incarnatione contra Arianos, c. 21) S. Athanasius says expressly that in Christ there are two wills.



clearly, if we avoid, in the first instance, that complication which arises from Christ's unity of Person, and take our illustration from the Immaculate Mother of God: for she was no less absolutely exempted than her Son from all combat between flesh and spirit. Take any one suffering then inflicted on her by God: e. g. His first announcement to her, that her Son was to die in anguish on the Cross.\* She was totally exempt from concupiscence; and there was therefore no emotion, however transient, of discontent or repugnance: still there was the keenest emotion of what we may call resigned sorrow. An act of the will would at once be elicited, in harmony with this emotion; and this act of the will may best be analyzed as a hypothetical act. "If this were not God's will, I should wish it otherwise." There was no shadow of sin or imperfection in such an act; nothing inconsistent with the most spotless sanctity: it was united throughout with the most unreserved and intense submission to God's will.

Let us now apply this to our Blessed Lord. And let us take His words, as reported by S. Matthew. "Pater, si possibile est, transeat a Me calix iste; veruntamen non sicut Ego volo, sed sicut Tu." He experienced the keenest emotion of sorrow which was ever experienced on earth. "Tristis est anima Mea usque ad mortem;" that is, as Lugo explains, His anguish would have destroyed life, except for a miracle: and it issued in the previously unknown prodigy of a bloody sweat. This emotion of resigned sorrow was accompanied, according to the laws of human nature, by a corresponding act of the will; which, as in the preceding case, may be thus analyzed: "If this were not Thy will, I should wish it otherwise." Finally He expressed this act of the will, by praying God that if it were possible—that is, if it were consistent with God's supreme decision—the cup might pass from Him. That this hypothetical act was accompanied all through by the most unreserved submission to God's will, is distinctly and emphatically expressed by the words, "Non sicut Ego volo, sed sicut Tu." Dr. Döllinger indeed, who dares to accuse Honorius of heresy, is himself guilty of a deplorable lapse from orthodoxy, and speaks as follows:—"A passing wish came over Him," says Dr. Döllinger, "that if it were possible the chalice of agony might pass from Him . . . but the next instant the clear returning consciousness of the irrevocable counsel of God triumphed in Him" ("First Age of Chris-

---

\* We prescind here of course from the wholly irrelevant question, whether, before the Incarnation, she knew that the Messiah would be crucified.

tianity," Mr. Oxenham's translation, vol. i. p. 54). That our Blessed Lord forgot for an "instant" "the irrevocable counsel of God" concerning His death, and that afterwards the "returning" consciousness of that counsel "triumphed" in His soul—these are statements which can only excite the amazement and horror of orthodox believers.

Now the question which Honorius seems to have asked himself is this:—Why are such expressions of Christ recorded, seeing that they may lead unstable souls into the monstrous error, of ascribing to Him two contrary wills? He replies thus:—"Οὐκ εἰσι ταῦτα διαφόρου θελήματος," "these are no indications of a will at variance with the divine."\* "'Αλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τῆς προσληφθείσης": "but they indicate an "οἰκονόμια," an "exhibition for our instruction," of the assumed humanity: i.e. they are recorded, for the purpose of impressing on us the vital truth, that Christ has really a human will. And so the next sentence explains the former:—"For these things were said *for our sake*, to whom He has given an example that we should follow His footsteps; teaching His disciples—teacher as He is of godliness—that we should not follow our own will, but each should prefer in all things the will of the Lord." In other words, by submitting so unreservedly His human will to the divine, He set us an example of our also submitting ours: but He could not set us this example, unless He made it unmistakably manifest that He *had* a human will. The purpose therefore of these expressions having been recorded, was to make unmistakably manifest this essential doctrine.

It is simply impossible to devise any interpretation of the two sentences, substantially different from this most emphatically Duothelistic interpretation. The accusers of Honorius must translate the words as meaning, that Christ so spoke for the purpose of impressing on us a *false* notion of His assumed humanity. Let any patristic scholar be consulted whether, as a mere matter of language, the word οἰκονόμια can bear any such sense: meanwhile for ourselves let us consider the thing as a matter of doctrine. Honorius, says Mr. Renouf, accounts such words of our Blessed Lord as "economical expressions used for our sakes" (p. 16). What does he mean by "for our sakes"? "For the sake of producing in us a *true*" or a "*false* impression"? If he gives the former answer, he admits at once the perfect orthodoxy of

---

\* As a mere matter of language, the word "διαφόρου" must signify "at variance," not simply "different in entity." The latter would be "ἄλλου" or "ἕτερου."

Honorius; which it is his very purpose to deny. If he gives the latter answer, what is the view which he ascribes to Honorius? This; that God the Son used language, which in every sense was totally mendacious, for the express purpose of deceiving His creatures into the acceptance of false doctrine. So unimaginable are the absurdities, into which prejudice may draw a man not naturally stupid.

It will be asked however, if Honorius was thus orthodox, why he objected to the phrase "two wills." If he did object to that phrase, our preceding remarks show it to be demonstratively certain, that such objection did not arise from his failing to hold Duothelism most explicitly. His objection must have arisen from his thinking, either that the novel phrase would foster the notion of two contrary wills; or else that it would at least be disliked by many orthodox persons, from *dread* of such being its tendency. But we know of no reason whatever for supposing that he did object to the phrase. Certain it is that he *stated* no objection to it, not having been consulted about it at all. The phrase submitted to his judgment was not "two wills," but "two operations."

Of this latter phrase, it is indubitable that he expressed the gravest disapproval. Now, even if we were totally unable to account for this, our controversial position would not be affected. He says no doubt expressly, that the phrase "two operations" is most undesirable and mischievous; but he says no less expressly, as has been seen, that Christ's human nature is "operative and a principle of action," and that it "operates those works which appertain to it." It is really not more certain that Honorius wrote his second Letter at all, than it is that He held firmly a principle of operation in Christ's human nature. Our position then would be quite impregnable, even if we could make it no stronger than this: if we had merely to say, that Honorius most certainly believed in Christ's human principle of operation; though for reasons, at this distance of time undiscoverable, he objected to the phrase "two operations."

It so happens however, that F. Bottalla has made a most important remark (pp. 52, 53), which throws a flood of new light over the whole subject. Petavius had already pointed out the different senses of the word "*ἐνέργεια*" ("De Incarnatione," l. 8, c. 1). This word, says F. Bottalla, was used in one sense by Sergius, and in a totally different sense by Honorius. The Greeks of the time commonly used it as signifying "a principle of operation;" but Honorius understood it as synonymous with "*ἐνέργημα*," the "effect and external action" itself. This sense, as F. Bottalla points out,

was not unknown to the Greeks of the sixth century; for where Honorius quotes the word “ἐνεργημάτων” from S. Paul, the Greek translator of his Letter gives the word “ἐνεργειῶν.” And that in point of fact Honorius understood the word in this sense, is manifest, not only from this very quotation of S. Paul, but also from the circumstance that this simple hypothesis removes all difficulty and obscurity from his Letters. It is not that, on any imaginable supposition, any sentence of those Letters presents the most superficial resemblance to Monothelism; but that there are various portions of them, to which, on any supposition except F. Bottalla’s, one cannot very easily affix any definite meaning at all.

When therefore Honorius heard of the phrase “δὺο ἐνέργειαι” being ascribed to Christ, he understood that those who so spoke ascribed to Him two, and two only, *classes of actions*. And he judged this on the one hand to be an artificial and unmeaning form of speech; while on the other hand it tended (so he thought) to encourage alike the Nestorian heresy of two operating *Persons*, and the no less detestable error of two human contrary wills. This being assumed, we take up his first Letter at the precise point where we left it, and proceed with its analysis.

Let us leave to heretics, he says, the phrases proper to heretics: “τοῖς . . . αἰρετικοῖς τὰ οἰκεῖα καταλιμπάνοντες.” [Let us leave, that is, the phrase “one operation” to Eutychians, and “two operations” to Nestorians.] And if any one [e.g., Sophronius] has used one of these expressions as his means for imbuing simple folk with Christian doctrine, let us not confuse the invention of an individual with the Church’s definition. Scripture is express in saying that Christ is the One Operator of both divine and human actions; but whether, because of there being divine and human actions, it is right to talk of “two operations,” is a question which we may leave to the grammarians. [Whether or no however it be grammatically appropriate, on theological grounds we had very far better avoid either of the two phrases.] What we find in Scripture is, not that Christ and His Spirit put forth *one* operation or *two*, but that He works *in many ways*. So S. Paul says that there are diversities of operations, but the same Operator. If then the Spirit Who proceeds from Christ works multiformly in Christians, how much more does Christ work multiformly and ineffably His various works in the flesh, with the participation and co-operation of both His natures. “Πολύτροπως καὶ ἀφράστως . . . τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ἐκάτερας φύσεως αὐτοῦ ἐνεργεῖν.” We ought then to speak as Scripture speaks; and avoid new-fangled phrases, which may be most

seriously misunderstood. It is a far greater calamity that the simple should be led astray, than that idle speculators should be indignant at our want of philosophical completeness: nor shall any one by vain philosophy seduce the disciples of the fishermen.

Of Honorius's second Letter, two fragments alone are extant, which were read in the Council. Of these the first denounces it as "altogether frivolous (*πάνυ μάταιον*)" to say that Christ is either of one or of two operations. Now most certainly no Christian of the time, were he Catholic or Monothelite, who understood by *ἐνέργεια* a "principle of operation," could say by possibility that the question was a frivolous one. It is obvious then that Honorius must have understood the word in some different sense altogether; and assuming F. Bottalla's hypothesis as to the Pontiff's meaning, nothing can be more just than the Pontiff's comment. As to the second fragment, its drift is now so superabundantly evident, that it would be merely wearisome to take it point by point.

We repeat then, that no more orthodox Pontiff than Honorius ever sat on S. Peter's throne. In fulfilling however his office as guardian of the Faith, he made one serious lapse, from which his memory has severely suffered. Yet Catholics must not on that account cease to remember his various claims to their gratitude and reverence. S. Leo II. cannot have intended this by his anathema; because (as F. Bottalla points out) he left Honorius's name in the diptychs, and his pictures in the churches.

We cannot better conclude, than by briefly characterizing and contrasting the two writers on whom we have commented throughout. As to Mr. Renouf, it would be an extravagant compliment to call him a Gallican; for, as we pointed out in our former article (p. 204), he more than insinuates that the *Ecclesia Docens* herself does not possess the gift of infallibility. We believe there is no theologian, who would qualify this tenet with a lighter censure than that of "heretical." We may sum up then Mr. Renouf's controversial character, with a certain epigrammatic completeness but really without a particle of exaggeration, by saying that his arguments are pitiable, his arrogance intolerable, and his doctrine heretical.

F. Bottalla has accomplished a very great work indeed; and it is a great pleasure to think that, in these critical and anxious times, the orthodox cause has at its service so learned and effective a champion. Now, for the first time, full justice has been done to the strength of Honorius's cause. That Pontiff's first apologists of recent times placed themselves in

a false position, by denying the authenticity of the documents. On the other hand, later writers (as we implied just now) have underrated the strength of the case, which can be made for him after every necessary admission of facts; and for this reason have spoken of him in too subdued and apologetic a tone. From the position in which F. Bottalla has now placed the controversy, we are very confident that no future critic will be able to dislodge it.

---

The Latin translation of the Greek translation of Honorius's first Letter runs as follows:—

Scripta fraternitatis vestræ suscepimus, per quæ contentiones quasdam et novas vocum quæstiones cognovimus introductas per Sophronium quemdam, tunc monachum nunc vero (ex auditu) episcopum Hierosolymitanæ urbis constitutum, adversus fratrem nostrum Cyrum Alexandriæ antistitem, unam operationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi conversis ex hæresi prædicantem. Qui denique ad vestram fraternitatem Sophronius veniens, querelamque hujusmodi deponens, multiformiter eruditus, petiit de his quæ a vobis fuerat instructus paginalibus sibi syllabis reserari: quarum literarum ad eundem Sophronium directarum suscipientes exemplar, et intuentes satis provide circumspecteque fraternitatem vestram scripsisse, laudamus novitatem vocabulî auferentem, quod posset scandalum simplicibus generare. Nos enim in quo percepimus oportet ambulare. Enimvero duce Deo perveniemus usque ad mensuram rectæ Fidei, quam Apostoli veritatis scripturarum sanctarum funiculo extenderunt, confitentes Dominum Jesum Christum Mediatorem Dei et hominum operatum divina mediâ humanitate verbo Deo naturaliter unitâ, Eundemque operatum humana ineffabiliter atque singulariter assumptâ carne discrete, inconfuse, atque inconvertibiliter plena divinitate: et Qui coruscavit in carne plenâ divinis miraculis, Ipse est et carneus effectus plene Deus et homo: passiones et opprobria patitur Unus Mediator Dei et hominum in utrisque naturis: Verbum caro factum, et habitavit in nobis: Ipse Filius hominis de cœlo descendens: Unus atque Idem, sicut scriptum est, crucifixus Dominus majestatis: dum constet divinitatem nullas posse perpeti humanas passiones: et non de cœlo, sed de sanctâ est assumpta caro Dei genitrice: (nam per se Veritas in evangelio ita inquit: "Nullus ascendit in cœlum, nisi Qui de cœlo descendit, Filius hominis qui est in cœlo:") profecto nos instruens, quod divinitati unita est caro passibilis ineffabiliter atque singulariter, ut discrete atque inconfuse sic indivise videretur conjungi.

Ut nimirum stupendâ mente mirabiliter manentibus utrarumque naturarum differentiis cognoscatur uniri. Cui Apostolus concinens, ad Corinthios ait: "Sapientiam loquimur inter perfectos, sapientiam vero non hujus sæculi, neque principum hujus sæculi, qui destruuntur, sed loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio absconditam, quam prædestinavit Deus ante sæcula in gloriam nostram; quam nemo principum hujus sæculi cognovit: si enim cognovissent,



nunquam Dominum majestatis crucifixissent.” Dum profecto divinitas nec crucifigi potuit, nec passiones humanas experiri vel perpeti, sed propter ineffabilem conjunctionem humanæ divinæque naturæ, idcirco et ubique Deus dicitur pati et humanitas ex cœlo cum divinitate descendisse. Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur domini nostri Jesu Christi : quia profecto a divinitate assumpta est nostra natura, non culpa : illa profecto quæ ante peccatum creata est, non quæ post prævaricationem vitiatæ. Christus enim Dominus, in similitudine carnis peccati veniens, peccatum mundi abstulit, et de plenitudine Ejus omnes accepimus : et formam servi suscipiens, habitu inventus est ut homo : quia sine peccato conceptus de Spiritu sancto, etiam absque peccato est partus de sanctâ et immaculatâ virgine Dei genitrice, nullum experiens contagium vitiatæ naturæ. Carnis enim vocabulum duobus modis sacris eloquiis boni malique cognovimus nominari. Sicut scriptum est : “Non permanebit Spiritus meus in hominibus istis, quia caro sunt.” Et Apostolus : “Caro, et sanguis regnum Dei non possidebunt.” Et rursum : “Mente servio legi Dei, carne autem legi peccati. Et video aliam legem in membris meis, repugnantem legi mentis meæ, et captivum me trahentem in legem peccati quæ est in membris meis.” Et alia multa hujusmodi in malo absolute solent intelligi vel vocari. In bono autem ita, Isaiâ prophetâ dicente : “Veniet omnis caro in Hierusalem, et adorabunt in conspectu Meo.” Et Job : “In carne meâ videbo Deum.” Et alii ; “Videbit omnis caro salutare Dei.” Et alia diversa. Non est itaque assumpta, sicut præfati sumus, a Salvatore vitiatæ natura quæ repugnaret legi mentis Ejus, sed “venit quærere et salvare quod perierat,” id est, vitiatam humani generis naturam. Nam lex alia in membris aut voluntas diversa non fuit vel contraria Salvatori, quia super legem natus est humanæ conditionis. Et si quidem scriptum est : “Non veni facere voluntatem Meam, sed Ejus qui misit Me, Patris.” et : “Non quod ego volo, sed quod Tu vis Pater :” et alia hujusmodi : non sunt hæc diversæ voluntatis, sed dispensationis humanitatis assumptæ. Ista enim propter nos dicta sunt, quibus dedit exemplum ut sequamur vestigia ejus, pius magister discipulos imbuens, ut non suam unusquisque nostrum, sed potius Domini in omnibus præferat voluntatem. Viâ igitur regiâ incedentes, et dextrorsum vel sinistrorsum venatorum laqueos circumpositos evitantes, ne ad lapidem pedem nostrum offendamus, Idumæis, id est terrenis atque hæreticis, propria relinquentes, nec vestigio quidem pedis sensûs nostri terram, id est, pravam eorum doctrinam, omnimodo atterentes, ut ad id quo tendimus, hoc est ad fines patrios, pervenire possimus, ducum nostrorum semitâ gradientes. Et si forte quidam balbutientes, ut ita dicam, nisi sunt proferentes exponere, formantes se in specimen nutritorum, ut possent mentes imbuere auditorum, non oportet ad dogmata hæc ecclesiastica retorquere, quæ neque synodales apices super hoc examinantes, neque auctoritates canonicæ visæ sunt explanasse, ut unam vel duas energias aliquis præsumat Christi Dei prædicare, quas neque evangelicæ vel apostolicæ literæ, neque synodalis examinatio super his habita, visæ sunt terminasse : nisi fortassis, sicut præfati sumus, quidam aliqua balbutiendo docuerunt, condescendentes ad informandas mentes atque intelligentias parvulorum, quæ ad ecclesiastica dogmata trahi non debent ; quæ unusquisque, in sensu suo abundans, videtur secundum propriam

sententiam explicare. Nam quia Dominus Jesus Christus, Filius ac Verbum Dei, per Quem facta sunt omnia, Ipse sit Unus Operator divinitatis atque humanitatis, plenæ sunt sacræ literæ luculentius demonstrantes. Utrum autem, propter opera divinitatis et humanitatis, una an geminæ operationes debeant derivatæ dici vel intelligi, ad nos ista pertinere non debent; relinquentes ea grammaticis, qui solent parvulis exquisita derivando nomina venditare. Nos enim non unam operationem vel duas Dominum Jesum Christum Ejusque Sanctum Spiritum sacris literis percepimus, sed multiformiter cognovimus operatum. Scriptum est enim: "Si quis Spiritum Christi non habet, hic Ejus non est." Et alibi: "Nemo potest dicere, dominus Jesus, nisi in Spiritu Sancto. Divisiones vero gratiarum sunt, Idem autem Spiritus: et divisiones ministrationum sunt, Idem autem Dominus: et divisiones operationum sunt, Idem vero Deus, Qui operatur omnia in omnibus." Si enim divisiones operationum sunt multæ, et has omnes Deus in membris omnibus pleni corporis operatur, quanto magis Capiti nostro Christo domino hæc possunt plenissime coaptari? ut caput et corpus unum sit perfectum, "ut profecto occurrat," sicut scriptum est, "in virum perfectum, in mensuram ætatis plenitudinis Christi." Si enim in aliis, id est in membris Suis, Spiritus Christi multiformiter operatur, in Quo vivunt, moventur, et sunt: quanto magis per Semetipsum, Mediatorem Dei et hominum, plene ac perfecte multisque modis et ineffabilibus confiteri nos communione utriusque naturæ condecet operatum? Et nos quidem secundum sanctiones divinatorum eloquiorum oportet sapere vel spirare; illa videlicet refutantes, quæ quidem novæ voces noscuntur sanctis Dei ecclesiis scandala generare: ne parvuli aut duarum operationum vocabulo offensi, sectantes Nestorianos nos vesana sapere arbitrentur: aut certe, si rursus unam operationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi fatendam esse censuerimus, stultam Eutychianistarum attonitis auribus dementiam fateri putemur: præcavescentes, ne quorum inania arma combusta sunt, eorum cineres redivivos ignes flammivomarum denuo renovent quæstionum; simpliciter atque veraciter confitentes Dominum Jesum Christum Unum Operatorem divinæ atque humanæ naturæ, electius arbitantes, ut vani naturarum ponderatores: otiose negotiantes et turgidi adversus nos insonent vocibus ranarum philosophi, quam ut simplices et humiles spiritu populi Christiani possint remanere jejuni. Nullus enim decipiet per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam discipulos piscatorum, eorum doctrinam sequentes; omnia enim argumenta scopulosa disputationis callidæ atque fluctivaga in eorum retia sunt collisa. Hæc nobiscum fraternitas vestra prædicet, sicut et nos ea vobiscum unanimiter prædicamus; hortantes vos, ut unius vel geminæ novæ vocis inductum operationis vocabulum aufugientes, Unum nobiscum Dominum Jesum Christum Filium Dei vivi, Deum verissimum, in duabus naturis operatum divinitus atque humanitus, fide orthodoxâ et unitate catholica prædicetis.—Deus te inculumem custodiat dilectissime atque sanctissime frater.

The two extant fragments of his second Letter run as follows, in the Latin translation of their Greek translation:—

Nec non et Cyro fratri nostro Alexandriæ civitatis præsuli, quatenus

novæ adinventionis unius vel duarum operationum vocabulo refutato, claro Dei ecclesiarum præconio nebulosarum concertationum caligines offundi non debeant vel aspergi ; ut profecto unius vel geminæ operationis vocabulum noviter introductum ex prædicatione fidei eximatur. Nam qui hæc dicunt, quid aliud nisi juxta unius vel geminæ naturæ Christi Dei vocabulum, ita et operationem unam vel geminam suspicantur ? Super quod clara sunt divina testimonia. Unius autem operationis vel duarum esse vel fuisse Mediatorem Dei et hominum Dominum Jesum Christum, sentire et promere satis ineptum est.

Et quidem, quantum ad instruendam notitiam ambigentium, sanctissimæ fraternitati vestræ per eam insinuandam prævidimus. Ceterum quantum ad dogma ecclesiasticum pertinet quod tenere vel prædicare debemus, propter simplicitatem hominum et amputandas inextricabiles quæstionum ambages, sicut superius diximus, non unam vel duas operationes in Mediatore Dei et hominum definire ; sed utrasque naturas, in uno Christo unitate naturali copulatas, cum alterius communione operantes atque operatrices confiteri debemus : et divinam quidem, quæ Dei sunt operantem ; et humanam, quæ carnis sunt exequentem : non divise, neque confuse, aut convertibiliter, Dei naturam in hominem et humanam in Deum conversam edocentes ; sed naturarum differentias integras confitentes : Unus enim atque Idem est humilis et sublimis : æqualis Patri et minor Patre : Ipse ante tempora, natus in tempore est : per Quem facta sunt sæcula, factus in sæculo est : et Qui legem dedit, factus sub lege est, ut eos qui sub lege erant redimeret : Ipse crucifixus, Ipse chirographum quod erat contra nos evacuans in cruce, de potestatibus et principatibus triumphavit. Auferentes ergo, sicut diximus, scandalum novellæ adinventionis, non nos oportet unam vel duas operationes definientes prædicare ; sed pro unâ, quam quidam dicunt, operatione, oportet nos unum Operatorem Christum Dominum in utrisque naturis veridice confiteri : et pro duabus operationibus, ablato geminæ operationis vocabulo, ipsas potius duas naturas, id est, divinitatis et carnis assumptæ, in unâ Personâ Unigeniti Dei Patris, inconfuse, indivise, atque inconvertibiliter nobiscum prædicare propria operantes. Et hoc quidem beatissimæ fraternitati vestræ insinuandum prævidimus, quatenus unius confessionis propositum unanimatati vestræ sanctitatis monstremus, ut profecto in uno spiritu anhelantes, pari fidei documento conspiremus. Scribentes etiam communibus fratribus Cyro et Sophronio antistitibus, ne novæ vocis, id est, unius, vel geminæ operationis, vocabulo insistere vel immorari videantur : sed abrasâ hujusmodi novæ vocis appellatione, Unum Christum dominum nobiscum in utrisque naturis divina vel humana prædicent operantem. Quamquam hos, quos ad nos prædictus frater et coepiscopus noster Sophronius misit, instruximus, ne duarum operationum vocabulum deinceps prædicare innitatur ; quod instantissime promiserunt prædictum virum esse facturum, si etiam Cyrus frater et coepiscopus noster ab unius operationis vocabulo discesserit.

## ART. VIII.—IRELAND AND THE NEW MINISTRY.

*Speeches of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., delivered at Warrington, Ormskirk, Liverpool, Southport, Newton, Leigh, and Wigan, in October, 1868. London : Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.*

THE crisis which for four years we have desired and predicted has at last arrived. In 1865, when Lord Palmerston as Prime Minister had just assured the House of Commons that emigration to America was the real and only cure for the ills of Ireland, and when Sir Robert Peel, who was Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, had lately declared that his noble chief and he were determined to stand or fall with the Irish Church Establishment, we ventured to say that there was “wanted a Policy for Ireland.”\* “Ireland,” we said, “wants on the part of British statesmen a policy; and still more, on the part of the British Parliament, good will to assist and give efficacy to that policy.” For we continued, “the animus of Parliament (of the majority of Parliament, taking both Houses together, we mean of course), in considering the affairs of Ireland, is even still, three generations after the Union, that of one nation dealing with another nation; dealing with it not perhaps exactly as an enemy, but as an obstacle, a nuisance, a reproach, a cause of continual incomprehensible annoyance, and occasional serious danger, an opposite ‘moral essence’ to itself, with different instincts and habits, which it is impossible to gratify and not even easy to apprehend.” We ventured to hope that Parliament would not always act, “where Irish interests are concerned, only under the influence of alarm;” but we also feared, though the Government of that time did not recognize the very existence of Fenianism, that we were “approaching a period of such ignominious arguments again.” Having stated in general outline our views of what a policy for Ireland ought to be, we said, looking some little way beyond the régime of Lord Palmerston, that it ought to be “possible to persuade one of the coming statesmen of the next ten years, Mr. Gladstone if not Mr. Disraeli, that it is his interest, and in a sense his necessity to have a clear and comprehensive policy for Ireland.” What we ventured to hope has happened exactly

---

\* DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1865, Art. VI.—“Wanted a Policy for Ireland.”

as we wished it would. Mr. Gladstone has succeeded Mr. Disraeli as Prime Minister on the specific issue of the policy of the government of Ireland. Irish policy is the principal object which engages the minds of English statesmen. And owing especially to the ardour, energy, and devotion with which Mr. Gladstone has declared and sustained his policy, the inertness and prejudice of Parliament has been in a great measure overcome; and the country has elected a new House of Commons pledged, as its first task, to the sustainment of a just and a complete policy for Ireland.

In the course of the events which have led to this great result, the position of the Irish Catholics, and to a great extent that of all the Catholics of the United Kingdom, in regard to political parties, has considerably changed. Our ideal of their proper attitude in Parliament under such a Government as that of Lord Palmerston was, as we often stated, that commonly defined by the words Independent Opposition. We are bound now to take clear note of the fact that when Independent Opposition was first promulgated as a general principle of public action by the Irish Catholic Hierarchy, in conjunction with the principal political leaders of the Irish Catholics, and was very largely accepted by the Irish constituencies at the general election of 1852—that it was not a factious, indiscriminate, and endless opposition to all governments that was contemplated, but one directed to certain definite ends, in themselves a legitimate and not unreasonably remote object of party combination—and that it was specifically defined that the party then formed should act in independent opposition to all such governments as had not made religious equality in Ireland, and a just settlement of the law of landlord and tenant cabinet questions. It is a simple matter of fact that Mr. Gladstone has done this, and something more. He has not only made these questions cabinet questions—he has given them the first place in the plans of his Ministry; he has stated the order in which he intends to proceed with them; and he has gone to the country, and taken the verdict of a general election upon one principal and specific issue, the policy to be pursued in the government of Ireland. It was a great risk, considering the exasperated condition of English feeling, after the rescue at Manchester and the explosion at Clerkenwell—considering also the previously divided and insubordinate condition of the Liberal party. It was attended by personal mortifications, very keenly felt; for having first lost his seat Oxford University, in consequence of his opinions touching the Irish Church, he, at the last election, lost his seat for

his native county through the same cause. But the cause, nevertheless, triumphed through its greatness, its justice, and the genius and zeal which were given to its advocacy; and Mr. Gladstone is, in consequence, Prime Minister, with a majority strictly pledged to support his policy, the like of which no English minister has had since Mr. Pitt.

This is a period of such rapid changes in our political system, that to speak of the Irish policy of Lord Palmerston seems nearly as much out of place as it would be to speak of the Irish policy of Lord North; and when we refer to the formation of the party of Independent Opposition, we seem to be dealing with some half-forgotten chapter in the archæology of Irish agitation. But it is important to revert to this remote period of sixteen or seventeen years ago, at the present moment, for several reasons. One of these is, that the party of Independent Opposition, having been strangely subverted, and ultimately reduced almost to nonentity, the popular forces which it had controlled and directed, fell a prey to Fenianism. In precise proportion as the one waned the other waxed strong. This was not the only result. Throughout Ireland there followed, on the part of powerful sections of the Catholic clergy and laity, an apathy in regard to politics, a distrust in the faith of public men, which still exists, and which it is very difficult to dispel. Towards Mr. Gladstone, and in some degree towards Mr. Bright, there is a growing feeling of grateful and enthusiastic devotion. The words are strong, but the Irish are an intense people. At the same time it may, without offence, be said, that enthusiastic devotion is not the kind of feeling which was likely to be excited in the country of Grattan and O'Connell, by those who were the local liberal leaders at the moment when Mr Gladstone introduced his famous resolutions. Those right honourable, honourable, and (in a large proportion) learned gentlemen showed no special anxiety indeed when the Irish Reform Bill was before the House, to increase the electoral power of the country, so as to enhance the force of its verdict; and gladly consented to pass whatever Lord Mayo proposed, in order to preserve Portarlington the smallest borough in the empire, but the only place in Ireland where the late Attorney General, Mr. Lawson, had the chance of getting a seat. Such things have their effect, even when it is not very loudly testified. Accordingly, the balance between the two parties was actually less disturbed at the Irish elections than at the English, the Welsh, or the Scotch. It is evident that the popular force of the Irish nation, long disorganised, has not, as yet, rallied. It will, we believe, soon steadily, if not very rapidly or vehemently, re-assert itself. To the many h



mind and influential men with whom it rests to quicken public action in the country—who have held aloof so long from politics which they believed had only personal or factious objects—it is fit and salutary to say that the triumph of to-day is, in a very decided sense, the triumph of their principles; and that by a concurrence of causes, but with a general conviction of its wisdom and justice, the great object for which they organized the Independent Party of 1852 has been achieved, in the construction of a Cabinet pledged to establish religious equality in Ireland, and to give to the Irish tenantry their just rights.

A level of very respectable mediocrity is said to be characteristic of the new members of the new Parliament, so far as has been yet ascertained; and the tendency in Ireland for some time, owing to the very causes we have just indicated, has been towards a lower and coarser stamp of intellect and character in popular candidates for the House of Commons. Among the Irish members in the last Parliament there was a certain proportion of men who studied political questions without considering their mere party effect, and there were a few of more than ordinary abilities. But remembering the scandalous shuffle by which the Irish Reform Bill was passed, and contrasting it with the fine fight made by the Scotch members on their Bill—remembering the fact that in the debate on the Irish Church question, there was not an Irish Catholic who could be named on the same plane with Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Bernal Osborne, or Mr. Roebuck, it may be doubted whether Ireland ever was more wretchedly represented, in point of political talent and purpose. Thirty years ago, O'Connell and Shiel would have known how to sustain the honour of the country in such a debate; nor, had it occurred in 1853, would Lucas, Duffy, Moore, have been unequal to the task. But after the exhaustive and powerful speech of Mr. Maguire, early in last session, we know of nothing contributed to the debates by the Irish members on the great question of the day, which can be very readily remembered. The dissolution has since enabled two Catholic constituencies to deprive themselves of the services of two members of Parliament who were peculiarly qualified to be useful to Catholic interests in the many difficult discussions which are now imminent. Sir George Bowyer has a knowledge of Canon and Civil Law, of the great questions concerning the relations between Church and State, of the English as well as the Roman law with regard to ecclesiastical establishments—rare, if not unique, among Catholic public men. Sir Joseph McKenna has such a thorough knowledge

of the material state of the country, and of its financial conditions and capacity, that he could hardly fail to have taken a useful part in the consideration of those weighty details of disestablishment and disendowment in which the House will soon have to engage. The defeat of two such men is no advantage to Catholic interests. On the other hand, hearing that Mr. Moore, after a seclusion of upwards of ten years from public life, has been again elected for Mayo County, one is reminded of Curran's words when, from the Newry hustings, he spoke of Plunket's election, in 1812 :—"He goes like Gylippus, whom the Spartans sent alone as a reinforcement to their distressed ally ; Gylippus, in whom were concentrated all the energies and all the talents of his country." This election alone would save the honour of Ireland. A man of strong convictions, of unflinching courage, who knows his country perfectly well, and Parliament not less well, Mr. Moore is, besides, a speaker of masterly vigour and scholarly style. The tradition of the great Irish tribunes still lives in his racy, brilliant, and finished eloquence.

In constructing his Government, Mr. Gladstone evidently kept in view its primary purpose. He insisted that Mr. Bright should take office. He gave the Irish Secretary, Mr. Fortescue, a seat in the Cabinet. He liberally recognized Mr. Lowe's reconciliation with his party, achieved by his great speech on the Irish Establishment, by giving him his own former office, the second in importance of the Government. In every degree of State, from the Lord Chancellorship down, the Irish policy of the Cabinet seemed to be the Premier's first consideration. In Ireland he had the good fortune to inaugurate his Government by making an appointment, which it is no exaggeration to describe as the most popular appointment that an English minister ever made in connection with the administration of that country. He was enabled by the act which we owe to Sir Colman O'Loghlen's zeal and tact, to offer the woolsack to a Roman Catholic ; and he selected in Judge O'Hagan one whose blameless fame, whose eminent abilities, and whose thorough knowledge of the country, made his selection the pledge of a new era in its government. It was reported that Mr. Gladstone was even anxious to have placed a Roman Catholic in the Cabinet ; and it is to be hoped that Mr. Monsell, the only Irish Catholic who has claims adequate to such a rank, may, ere long, be promoted from his present secondary rank.

The attitude of the Catholics of Ireland throughout the great constitutional crisis to which a desire to do justice to them has led, is, we may fairly say, much to their honour.

They have shown no unworthy temper. There has been far less religious rancour manifested in the Irish elections, as a whole, than in the English. Even at Belfast, where a contested election at such a time might have been expected to produce scenes of violence and confusion, the Orangemen and the Catholics to some extent fraternized; the Orange candidate, Mr. Johnson, being, at all events, not more hostile to Mr. Gladstone than to Mr. Disraeli, and perhaps even in some degree open to conviction on the subject of disestablishment,—being besides the hero of the Ulster tenantry rather than the Ulster landlords. The attitude of the Irish Protestants, on the other hand, is astounding to one who knows the temper of that haughty and militant community. Every English journal is daily discussing what is to be done with them—how far disestablishment is to go, and where disendowment is to stop—whether they are to be allowed to continue to believe in the Thirty-nine Articles, or to be converted into a new sort of Presbyterian sect by Act of Parliament. And lo! they make no sign, they utter no significant word; they are as still as “the corpse on the dissecting-table.” Having so long looked up to England as the shrine of their faith and the buckler of their power—having so long regarded themselves as the garrison of English authority and the missionaries of English religion in Ireland—they can hardly believe that it is England which levels this awful blow at what they regard as the very ark of the covenant between the two countries. They feel simply stunned. They cannot realize, they do not seem to care, more or less, what is to happen. When their Primate hints to the House of Lords that they will all turn Papists, or at least Fenians, there is no one to utter the old loyal wrath of the race. And no one either to say, Why not? The questions which at present engage public opinion in England concerning the process of disestablishment do not appear to interest them. Yet surely they are questions vital to the conscience of a community with a real zeal for its religion. It seems to be assumed at present by leading organs of English opinion, that not merely can an Act of Parliament disestablish and disendow, but that it can compel the Irish Protestant to renounce his belief in the Queen as Head of the Church, and inflict upon him a sort of imitation of the Presbyterian General Assembly as a Church government instead. After all, the Irish Protestant is an Episcopalian, and he is not in the same position as the Scotch Episcopalian, because in Scotland the Queen claims to be Head of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland, and she cannot claim to be the Head of two different Churches in the same kingdom at the same precise time. But this is not the

case in Ireland, where the Queen has never even claimed to be considered as Head of the Catholic Church, and where the ruling difference in law, in government, in all the relations of life, has been specifically marked for ages by the never absent consideration that the King was the head of the one religion, and the Pope was the head of the other. The Irish Protestant will still retain many of the outward and visible signs, which convey to the mass of the people the sense of his supremacy. He will retain the cathedrals consecrated in Catholic ages to the shrines of Irish saints, and in every parish the church built with public money, the freehold manse and glebe. As yet the Ecclesiastical Titles Act does not affect his Bishop's title, as yet not merely the Queen, but the Queen's Viceroy, must profess his faith. His Primate leads the Roll of Precedence; his Bishops sit in the Privy Council. As yet the great University of the country only tolerates those who utter the Roman creed. He retains for a time many of the advantages of a State Church, while he acquires those of a Free Church. But this would not be religious equality in Ireland, and it is religious equality in Ireland that Mr. Gladstone stands pledged to accomplish. Therefore, however the question of the Royal Supremacy as an article of faith may be dealt with—and the Irish Protestants alone know, and have not yet declared what they really believe or are prepared to believe on that point,—the Catholics of Ireland have a right to protest against the setting up of any new form of Church Establishment or Church Government for Ireland by Act of Parliament. At present, it is well to remember the Catholic Church has no legal sanction for any of its acts, except marriage between its own members, in Ireland; and before it can be said to be placed on a level of equality even with the disestablished Protestant Church, there is a considerable fabric of bad law that will have to come down.

As to the great question of all, the disposition of the Funds that will result from the disendowment of the Establishment, we have had only one opinion from the moment that the Irish bishops declared they would have none of them. It has been suggested that the fund resulting shall be applied to the liquidation of the poor-rates. But the landlord is at present obliged to pay half the poor-rates. It is conceived that he will be permitted to commute the payment of the tithe rent-charge, on the liberal terms which may be presumed from a Parliament not yet void of his class. If the sum so accumulated be applied to the liquidation of the other great charge on his land, then the landlord will be in reality the one person

benefited, enormously benefited, by the result; and according to the custom of his class, he will testify his pleasure by raising his rent in order to recoup himself for the temporary pressure caused by the charge of commuting his tithe. This perhaps will not be quite the best way to bring home the advantages of disestablishment to the hearts and hearths of the people. It has been suggested that the fund should be applied to educational purposes. The present fund, and the funds properly available for that purpose, supposing religious equality to be established in Ireland, are, if properly employed and economized, ample. Ireland draws no more than her fair proportion from the Consolidated Fund for primary education. The revenues of Trinity College, of the Queen's Colleges, of the Royal Schools, of a number of special educational foundations for the benefit of Protestants, in which the State participated, will, we presume, lose their exclusive character; and we would fain hope be fairly divided on the denominational basis. Again, it seems to us that it would be impossible to use the Establishment fund in founding hospitals. Ireland has more hospitals, in proportion to its population, and a better organized system of medical relief for the poor, than England has, than any country perhaps in Europe has. Besides, this again would be to pay off the poor-rates. Amid so many striking suggestions, why has no one propounded the captivating idea that the whole country should be thorough-drained and planted, so that there should not be the sign of a bog left on its surface, and the balmy, sunny, bird-and-flower-abounding climate of the days of Ossian be restored? This would be some benefit to the people, whose benefit it seems to be so awfully hard to insure by law,—they whose long, low cry of anguish has been heard far abroad in all the lands of man until it has at last called down judgment on one of the great iniquities of their state—

“ A doleful song,

Steaming up a lamentation, and an ancient tale of wrong,  
Like a tale of little meaning, tho' the words are strong ;  
Chanted from an ill-used race of men that cleave the soil,  
Sow the seed, and reap the harvest with enduring toil,  
Till they perish and they suffer.”

It is for them that we would plead in this great settlement, the pure, patient, long-oppressed, the brave and gentle people of Ireland—who have not a characteristic fault that is not due to the cruel insecurity of their lot; who love justice as no other

people under the sun love it ; who, in all that removes the condition of the Catholics of Ireland from their state under the penal laws, have always fought the battle, and never sought the spoil. It is possible, it is easy, it is easier than anything else to lower the alien Church, and plant the peasant in his own soil at the same stroke. Give the landlord the tithe rent-charge with one hand ; but with the other, abolish at once and for ever, tenancy at will as a base tenure, contrary to the spirit of the law of England, and incompatible at once with the proper practice of the industry of agriculture and with the personal liberty of the subject of a free state.

---



## Notices of Books.

---

*Concilii Plenarii Baltimoriensis II. Acta et Decreta.* Baltimoræ : excudebat  
JOANNES MURPHY.

**W**E have received this very interesting volume, through the courtesy of Archbishop Spalding ; and we ought perhaps to take some blame on ourselves, for not immediately noticing it in detail. But the whole circumstances, present condition, and past history of the Catholic Church in America, are so profoundly interesting both to English and also to Irish Catholics, that we have thought it better to delay, until we could devote an article to the entire subject. Meanwhile we heartily recommend a perusal of these Acts, to those who would appreciate the very important position now occupied by the Church in the United States, and the use which she is likely to make there of that position.

Some able articles have recently appeared in the *Tablet*, on the same general subject ; but with particular reference to the general confidence reposed in American Catholics, by their fellow-countrymen of all denominations, as *instructors of youth*.

We may add, that the American translation of M. Darras's invaluable Church history, brought out under the patronage of the illustrious Archbishop of Baltimore, contains a most full and interesting appendix on "the Catholic Church in the United States." That Church "now counts," we are told, "seven archbishoprics, thirty-six bishoprics, and four apostolic vicariates." The names, subscribed to the Acts, are those of seven archbishops, thirty-seven bishops, and four others.

---

*Daily Meditations.* By his Eminence the late CARDINAL WISEMAN.  
Dublin : James Duffy, 15, Wellington Quay.

**T**HE name of its author renders any recommendation on our part of this volume superfluous. "It consists," says the Archbishop's preface "of meditations written by his Eminence the late Cardinal Wiseman in early life, when he entered upon his first responsible office, as Rector of the English College in Rome. They were intended to form the habit of mental prayer in the youth committed to his charge, and to infuse into the rising priesthood of England a spirit of personal

piety. In them we still recognize the voice we knew so well. Some will yet remember the days, sweet to memory, when these meditations were read in the venerable College, and will welcome them as a memorial of one to whom, under God, they owe perhaps the vocation which is their highest blessing."

The reader cannot, we think, fail to be struck with the exceeding simplicity and plain earnestness of these early productions of a mind so full and an imagination so exuberant as distinguished our great Cardinal even in sickness and old age. We select the following passages, from meditations on the divine mysteries nearest to his heart, and the prevalent devotion to which, in England, is so largely due to his words and example: the love of Jesus in the blessed Eucharist, and Mary's maternal relation to all the souls redeemed by her Divine Son:—

"Greater love than this no man hath, that a man should lay down his life for his friends. Although a mere man can have no demonstration of love to give beyond this, we may truly say that the God-man has found a degree of charity and a demonstration of it that goes much further. For, not content with having laid down His life for us, He has given us Himself to be our food, and to be most intimately united to us. Had He only died for us, immense, nay, infinite as the blessing and the favour would have been, there would have been an imperfection necessarily in the mode of applying to us individually the benefits of His passion. For had our affections alone been left to perform this important work, it must have contracted all their imperfections, and must have been coldly and languidly done. He willed, therefore, to employ an instrument, a channel for the transmission of His mercy equal, as it were, to the mercy itself. What could this be but Himself, who formed the very essence of the other? Such, then, was His institution of the Blessed Eucharist, wherein He gave Himself again to us, that the love exhibited by His death may not, through our misery be in vain. This, therefore, is a repetition of the immense charity and affection shown forth in His passion and bitter death. Reflect, further, how the tendency of all love is to procure the closest intimacy and familiarity between the persons who love; they would were their love perfect, deprive themselves, in a manner, of their individuality, and have but one soul, one heart. But the love of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament has carried love far beyond this imaginary point. For as nothing can be considered so thoroughly incorporated with us as the food and nourishment which we take, inasmuch as it actually becomes a part of ourselves, so Jesus took this form of communication with us, becoming our spiritual food, but received under species material and palpable. But then, as He is the far nobler, the mightier, the more energizing of the two, it follows that instead of His being incorporated with us, we, in a manner, are rather incorporated with Him, so as to become, according to the expression of the fathers, '*concorporei*,' having a common body with Him. What can be conceived beyond this manifestation of love? Still, to appreciate it further, if, on our part, the union be a most dignified and sublime one, what is it on His? He comes, then, into a frail earthen vessel, a mere tabernacle of perishable clay, into the body of this death, into a heart full of vanity, pride, folly, and dissipation. He comes into a body defiled with a thousand iniquities, and unworthy of the smallest visitation of His mercy; a body that shortly will become the food of worms. Here is love, indeed, and what love! to overcome His natural repugnance to so much that is

corrupt and odious in His sight, that He may satisfy His affection for us."

"The Church of God has always believed that when Jesus upon the cross recommended John to his dear mother, as her son, it was not merely that disciple individually, but every one of us whom He had in view. For certain it is that, from the earliest times, Mary has been considered not only as the mother of Christ, but also the mother of all those that love Him—the mother of all the faithful. If she is said in Scripture to have laid up and preserved in her heart those first words of her son's ministry, when found at twelve years of age in the Temple, can we imagine she did less for His last dying words, His legacy on the Cross? . . . . But Jesus did not content Himself with procuring to us this adoption with this single address to His mother. He took care again and again to call us His brethren, and to treat us as such, so that it should seem but natural that we should have the same mother. For before His Passion He was content to call His disciples friends. '*Jam non dicam vos servos. . . . vos amici mei estis.*' But immediately after His blessed passion, He calls them His brethren, '*Nuntiate fratribus meis.*' (Mat. xxviii. 10; John xx. 17.) Now, although the primary and inestimable right obtained by us through this acknowledgment, is that of being called and being sons of God, through the adoption *above* the cross, yet does it not less secure to us all other rights of fraternity with us, and, among the greatest, the adoption which was made of us *beneath* the cross, in the heart of Mary. And as Jesus has a Father in heaven but no Mother, and chose similarly to have a mother on earth but no father, so that we may be like Him in all things, having given us His Father to be ours, though he be from us in nature most disjoined, He could not withhold from us the same Mother, who is of our flesh and blood, and whose tenderness and love for His brethren must be so great. Nay, how could the kind and benevolent heart of Mary have brooked that her parental interests should alone have been excluded from the circumstances and conditions of our obtaining His brotherhood?"

We add a most interesting testimony from the *Tablet*, of Dec. 12, evidently written by an intimate friend of the Cardinal. It is very far more significant in his case than it would be in almost any other, because he was so singularly devoid of all religious ostentation and pretence. He was indeed careless to a fault about giving what is called "edification;" and was indeed too indifferent to the good opinion of others, considering how greatly it forwards the Church's influence that the excellence of her princes should be duly appreciated.

"Dr. Wiseman was but a youth when he became Rector of the English College in Rome. His first religious instinct was to educate his students to a spirit of piety. He burned himself with zeal for the conversion of England; and though in a singular manner his charity was enlarged to such an extent as to make him long for the conversion of heathen nations, and to determine to establish in England a college for this very purpose, yet his chief mission was to England; and this was unmistakably indicated to him by the Vicar of our Lord, in making him Rector of the English College in the Via de Monserrato. How often it happens that God enlarges the heart in His own Divine way and by His secret influences, only in order the more effectively to concentrate the strength of a heart that has expanded under large and generous influences upon that particular field of work which his Vicar points out! We have known

more than one instance of this Divine training. And so it happened with Dr. Wiseman that his special mission was to England ; and he set about it as soon as he became Rector, by preparing the souls no less than the minds, of the future English priesthood for the work before them. *In meditatione med exardescit ignis.* This is the motto of the saints. This he illustrated as soon as he assumed the responsibility of Rector. Every morning he himself rose before 4 o'clock, and spent an hour in a meditation, which he wrote, and then had read to the students when they came down to the chapel at 5.30 a.m. Those who fed upon this food morning after morning will not have forgotten its savour even now, though the maturity of life, or even old age, may have overtaken them. We well remember the Cardinal's retreats to students and to the clergy, and certain of his sermons on the Passion and Life of our Lord. They were drawn chiefly from these very 'Meditations,' which, he more than once told the writer of these lines, were the 'stock-in-trade' which he had laid up for life in the tranquillity and stillness of those early mornings in the Collegio Inglese, before his struggles with the world had begun, before even the streets of Rome were awakened to their daily life. No doubt the Cardinal's retreats, and those more spiritual sermons to which we refer, did not earn for him, while yet alive, the reputation which welcomed him to the learned societies before whom he used to delight to lecture. This was natural ; for they were not submitted to a critical audience, nor did they become the theme of public journals. They were addressed to persons who came to be edified in the sense of being built up ; they were the action of the priest or the bishop direct upon the soul. They belonged to the inner life and to the mysteries of grace ; and therefore they lay hidden from the world and from public comment. We may add, that they were the least laboured, the most spontaneous, and therefore the most effective, of his public discourses. But there was a certain coyness, or rather, we should say, a certain simple humility in the Cardinal, which used to lead him to throw a veil over his more intimate acquaintance with the interior life of the soul. He passed among those who did not know him as a somewhat worldly, difficult, and unspiritual man. But there was an interior life within, which he kept strictly private—*secretum meum mihi.* To give only one instance. We had occasion once to speak to him upon the subject of ejaculatory prayer, and the sanctification of the daily routine or turmoil, whichever it may be, of life. 'Well,' he said, 'I'll give you my prayer. I have used it for over thirty years, and I may say it is scarcely ever out of my thoughts when I am at work. When engaged upon anything anxious, or even pausing in a letter, the words came up to me again and again. Here they are : I'll write them down for you, and you may try them: *Deus meus, Deus meus, nihil sum sed Tuus sum.* They help me through everything.' We narrate this little fact, not only for what it is worth in itself, and because it alone is a true picture of that deeper life of the Cardinal which remains as yet unknown, but because it may serve as a key to the soul which consecrated to meditation so many hours of life. Indeed, if it were necessary to examine the Cardinal's fitness to treat of the spiritual life, it would be enough to produce the testimony of the late General of the Jesuits, Father Roothan, who said of Dr. Wiseman's preface to an English edition of the 'Spiritual Exercises,' that he knew of no preface which had entered more scientifically into them."

A small part however of the preceding account was corrected by the following letter, which appeared in the next number of the *Tablet* :—

"SIR,—I hope the reviewer of Cardinal Wiseman's 'Meditations' will

allow me to modify some of the statements made by him; as his notice will probably be copied into other publications, and will be supposed, if left unaltered, to be as accurate as it is in other respects admirable.

"The Cardinal began to write his 'Meditations' after the retreat, which was given in the English College by the zealous and eloquent F. Massa, S.J., in November, 1837, and therefore, nine years after his promotion to the rectorship of the College. The notice represents him as rising at four, meditating for an hour, then writing out the meditation of the day, and giving it to the students to read at 5.30. The meditations were usually written in the course of the day or evening, and it was not until he had composed the meditations of a part of the year and laid them by for a considerable time, that the students discovered their existence, and induced him to allow them to be read in the chapel.

"Although some of the meditations were much longer than others, they were always written on four sides of a quarto sheet, and I trust the original sheets are still preserved by some of his many attached friends.

"T. G."

*Essay on First Principles.* By Very Rev. Canon WALKER. London: Longmans.

*Padre Liberatore and the Ontologists.* By Rev. C. MEYNELL, D.D. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

IT is our strong conviction, that Canon Walker and Dr. Meynell are by no means at such great mutual variance, as Dr. Meynell at least considers. We go quite as far as the latter in his abhorrence (p. 33) "of the godless psychologism which prevails in this country;" waiving, of course, his use of this particular word "psychologism": but we are confident that Canon Walker abhors it also. We have said indeed frankly, in our article on higher education, that we think it very important in England to lay much greater stress on the whole doctrine which concerns necessary truth, than various Catholic philosophers on the Continent have done. But Dr. Meynell himself states (p. 4) that all Catholics *recognize* "the objective character of necessary truth"; and the question therefore concerns, not the doctrine itself, but the stress laid on it.

However, these philosophical discussions are becoming of such great importance—particularly in their bearing on Catholic higher education—that we cannot feel we should do justice to them, by giving merely a notice of these two pamphlets. We hope therefore in our next number to give an article on "first truths," which shall consider in detail the various questions now raised. Here we will merely say, that we consider our two authors to have done very important service in promoting the requisite discussion.

In the same connection, we recommend our philosophical readers to study two notes, added by F. Dalgairns to the third edition of his work on "Holy Communion," which will be found respectively at pp. 410 and 415. In p. 416 however, there is a very absurd typographical mistake. The author points out, as does Canon Walker, that the schoolmen inculcate "the existence of intuitive," *i.e.* "non-inferential ideas." Instead of "non-inferential," the perplexed and perplexing printer has given "*even* inferential."

*A Word for Scientific Theology.* By JAMES MARTINEAU. London : Williams & Norgate.

*The Limits of Philosophical Inquiry.* By WILLIAM Lord Archbishop of York. Edinburgh : Edmonston & Douglas.

*The Conscience.* By F. D. MAURICE. London : MacMillan.

IN our article on Catholic higher education, we have referred to the pre-dominantly and indeed almost exclusively atheistic tendency of all vigorous philosophical schools of thought, among non-Catholic Englishmen of the day. Various indications however have reached us of a reaction setting in ; and we need hardly say how heartily all Catholic thinkers must sympathize with that reaction.

The three works named at the head of our notice—Mr. Maurice's a volume, the other two pamphlets—are very valuable, were it only in this point of view. Curiously enough, that one of the three—Mr. Martineau's—which is philosophically the most satisfactory, is theologically the most anti-Catholic : for the author occupies a large portion of his address, on one hand in defending mixed education, and on the other hand in assailing the inspiration of Scripture. But we will not shrink from saying, that we consider him among the very deepest and most accurate thinkers of our time on matters philosophical ; and we heartily wish he would put together—partly from his previous writings—a connected treatise on the whole subject.

Archbishop Thompson's address exhibits throughout much ability, and indeed some originality. We consider indeed that both his pamphlet and Mr. Martineau's might be studied with great advantage by Catholic professors of philosophy, who will know how to discriminate the sound from the unsound. We should say indeed that Dr. Thompson is more cowed than Mr. Martineau permits himself to be, by the atheistic aggressiveness of contemporary English philosophy ; and in three different places—the whole pamphlet containing only 27 pages—he goes out of his way to exhibit this timidity. "The evidence for" "God and freedom and duty and immortality" "is *less clear*," he says (pp. 23-4), "and the research *more difficult*, than for the facts of" physical "science." But then, he adds, we should "estimate knowledge not by its clearness but by the value of its objects." The "kind of inquiry" which issues in a knowledge "of God and freedom and duty and immortality is *obscure and difficult*" (p. 10), whereas physical inquiry is "easy and precise." Nay, the former at last (p. 26) cannot be accounted "*certain knowledge*."

Mr. Maurice's volume not only is not scientific, but hardly even professes to be so ; and this, though it consists of lectures delivered from the Cambridge Chair of casuistry and moral philosophy. But we think a large number of his incidental remarks not valuable only but profound ; and we greatly regret therefore, that he has not given himself the trouble—if indeed he possesses the power—of working them into a scientific whole. In particular we prize the stress laid by him on the Moral Faculty ; which, in common with the great majority of English Protestants, he calls the "conscience," and which gives its title to his whole course. Philosophical controversy is im-



minent against the Mill and Bain dynasty, unless irreligion and necessitarianism are to have it all their own way. And among the intellectual weapons available against that dynasty, we believe none will be found more effective and serviceable—perhaps none so much so—than that based on the undeniable existence in man, and the intrinsic character, of the Moral Faculty.

We cannot better conclude our notice, than by extracting the very powerful conclusion of Mr. Martineau's address.

“To decide whether duty is a refinement of interest and sympathy, or speaks with a distinct voice of its own, and whether compunction is a reflected image of the public anger or an indigenous notice of violated obligation, we must discriminate, by the most rigorous tests, the primitive material from the fabricated structure of our moral life. Whilst we hear all the religious phenomena explained away, on the one hand, as a tissue of artificial associations, spreading over the face of things a veil of illusion which is destined to dissolve like the ghosts already gone ;—and claimed, on the other hand, as the expression of native insight into things as they are, given us by the necessary postulates of reason and conscience ;—is it not evident that the last controversy is already passing on to the psychological field ; and that on the self-interpretation of human nature depends the continued recognition of the Divine ? Were it possible that the analyses of Thought and Will *now prevalent in the schools* should prove final, and that nothing should be found behind the current Logic of science, we should be living in the last age of Theology, and it would scarcely need another step for its self-knowledge to overbalance into self-extinction. Since, however, our ‘modern thought’ *does not solve, but only despair of*, the haunting problems of ‘Metaphysics,’ since again it makes no provision for any primary truths, but makes all our mental stores alike derivative,—and that from sensible experiences common to us with the brutes,—it may be surmised that intellectual curiosity may yet rise in discontent and reclaim its natural range ; that the device will not permanently succeed, of *shutting up vast chambers of human thought and labelling them ‘empty ;’* and that the relation between our phenomenal knowledge and what lies beyond it may be reconstrued, and lifted into a real relation, neither inscrutable nor insignificant. If so, there is a future still for philosophical theology ; and the death with which, from the time of Epicurus to that of Comte, it has been so often threatened by the expositors of natural laws and molecular hypotheses, will yet be postponed. ‘Modern thought’ is strong ; but ancient truths are stronger : and with the vigour of eternal youth they will re-assert their moral power, as the inexhaustible springs of noble and reverent action, and vindicate their intellectual place, *as the immovable bases of any satisfying philosophy.*”

---

*The Freedom of the Will stated afresh.* By E. M. LLOYD.  
London : Longmans.

MR. LLOYD has forwarded us a copy of this pamphlet, as presenting much similarity to our own remarks on Free Will in controversy with the Duke of Argyll. Mr. Lloyd thinks (p. 10) as we do, that the Duke is no less simply necessitarian than Mr. Mill himself ; that he has “sung a song of triumph as the champion of Free Will, while leaving all the spoils in the hands of the enemy.” But otherwise Mr. Lloyd's treatment of the great question is rather supplementary than confirmatory of ours. We did not

profess to argue for Free Will, but only to maintain that no result ensues from that doctrine at variance with any law of phænomenal sequence which can even be alleged as having received scientific proof. Mr. Lloyd, on the contrary (p. 51), waives that particular point which we treated, and employs himself mainly on a vigorous philosophical argument for the doctrine itself.

We cannot gather from the pamphlet what are its author's religious opinions. He assumes Theism all through. On the other hand, his concluding sentence expresses the greatest general confidence in Mr. Mill's guidance ; in another place (p. 18) he speaks of Christianity and Stoicism as "the two main fountain-heads of modern morality," and implies that neither "can be spared in man's education" ; and he begins with saying (p. 3), that "the cause of human liberty has perhaps as much to fear from its theological patrons as from its scientific assailants."

But whatever Mr. Lloyd's religious or irreligious opinions, we are not acquainted with any reply to Mill and Bain nearly so complete and satisfactory as this ; and we hope to make great use of it in an article on Free Will, before many quarters shall have elapsed. Mr. Mill does not seem to have known of the pamphlet ; for he makes no reply to it in the third edition of his work on Sir W. Hamilton, which contains a general answer to his critics. It must be admitted indeed, that one of Mr. Lloyd's arguments, and one on which he lays some stress, having been urged by another opponent of Mr. Mill's, has received from that gentleman a more or less successful answer (Lloyd, p. 13 ; Mill, p. 568). But on the substance of the controversy, we consider Mr. Lloyd triumphantly victorious.

His statement is excellent as to what would be man's condition if his will were not free. On such an hypothesis we should be "mere *spectators* at best" of our own moral condition (p. 2) ; we could do no more than "*take cognizance* of the thoughts and feelings which our organization and our inconstancies *determine*" (p. 24). A. would have no more control over his own moral character, than he has over B.'s.

Nothing can be more intelligible than Mr. Mill's proposition ; and it is indeed a great benefit to the cause of truth, that its ablest English opponent is so singularly clear and straightforward a thinker. A motive, he says (Lloyd, p. 15), "is proportioned" in strength "to the pleasantness *as conceived by us* of the thing desired, or the painfulness of the thing shunned." And this being understood, he lays down that at any given moment the will with infallible certainty follows its strongest motive. Here is a most definite statement, with which an opponent can fairly grapple on the ground of consciousness and experience : and Mr. Lloyd, in fact, grapples with it crushingly. We cannot too strongly recommend to our Catholic philosophical readers his whole argument from p. 15 to p. 21.

Mr. Lloyd is of course under great philosophical disadvantage, from not being a Catholic. We do not in this refer so much to his use of the word "will" and his language about the "ego ;" though no Catholic could follow him in these respects. Nor again of course do we refer to his silence on the doctrine of grace ; because, in a controversy against non-Catholics on the philosophical platform, even from a Catholic, theology would be out of place. But there are various facts known to pious Catholics which, as being matters

of *experience*, fall legitimately within the province of philosophy. We will give one or two instances.

The author quotes (p. 7) a pointedly expressed saying of Theodore Parker's. "It seems as if man were tied by two fetters—the one of historic circumstance, the other of his physical organization—fastened at opposite points: but the cord is elastic, and may be lengthened by use, or shortened by abuse and neglect." Nor can it fairly be doubted that at any given moment there are certain limits, within which alone the will has full moral power of action. But those limits in the direction of good are far less narrow, than any one supposes, who is unacquainted with the singular power possessed by *prayer*. Let the mind be thrown (if we may so express ourselves) into an attitude of prayer, and every Catholic priest well knows the extraordinary—it may almost be said the miraculous—power it obtains of resisting evil solicitations. As a mere matter of philosophical reasoning (we may observe, by the way) this repeatedly observed phenomenon necessarily must either be a very wonderful and anomalous psychological fact, or else must prove that the will is preternaturally assisted towards good.

Then secondly, Mr. Lloyd implies, unless we misunderstand him (see, e. g., p. 17), that the cases are comparatively rare in a man's life when he puts forth *effort* in the direction of good against lower solicitations. But the Catholic who tries to live in the presence of God, is very frequently indeed through the day occupied in this very effort. He is labouring to fix his thoughts on God, against the opposite solicitation of surrounding objects and interests.

Thirdly however, our author (p. 28), considers such "effort" to be far more commonly painful than good Catholics will admit it to be. Of course there are particular seasons, of violent temptation e. g. to mortal sin;—or again of aridity and the like in the case of the more saintly—; which would not only bear out Mr. Lloyd's description, but a great deal more. But, as a general rule, the interior Christian's effort at fixing his thoughts on God is accompanied by predominant sweetness and great sensible devotion. Indeed we believe there is one very remarkable fact fully borne out by experience. We believe it not unfrequently happens, that at the very moment when a man not alone speculatively knows, but practically realises, that his present state of feeling is actually much happier at the moment than that to which he is solicited, he is obliged nevertheless to put forth considerable effort if he would successfully resist such solicitation. This fact has always seemed to us among the strongest indications of human nature being corrupt.

In conclusion, we heartily hope that Mr. Lloyd's admirably clear and excellent principles on this fundamental question may be a means of gradually drawing him to sounder views on other cognate matters also; that he may see as clearly through Mr. Mill's fallacies on social liberty, as he now sees through the same writer's fallacies on liberty of the will. Who knows but that in due time our author may himself have sympathy with those "theological aims" which now so greatly repel him?

---

*Why Men do not Believe.* By L. J. LAFORET, Rector of the Catholic University of Louvain. London: Philp.

THE subject treated in this work is both speculatively and practically of great and growing importance; and useful service has been done by its translation into English. "Even in this country," says the translator (p. v.) "which owes so much to the conservative common-sense instincts of the English mind, there prevails scepticism and unbelief not only in the exclusive claims of this or that form of positive and dogmatic Christianity, but in any supernatural communication whatever of God to man." Indeed, we believe that this description might have been carried much further. We believe Mgr. Laforet's statement (p. ix.) to be not less borne out in England than in his own country; viz., that it is not "the denial of Christianity" alone which now contends against the Faith, but "of a personal and living God."

It is hardly possible then to exaggerate the desirableness, that Catholics shall fully appreciate the causes of this disease, in order that they may learn to apply a remedy thereto; and Mgr. Laforet, we may add, has exhibited at once the best possible spirit, and also much acuteness of remark. Closely connected with his question is another, on which the *Pall Mall Gazette* has recently published some remarks not less shallow than anti-Christian; we mean the profound evil accruing to many Catholics from unreserved intercourse with Protestants, or unreserved familiarity with Protestant literature. We are not without hope, that we may be able before long to give an article, which shall treat both these questions with a special view to the circumstances of England. The present volume will be of great assistance to us in such an enterprise.

The author makes an observation in page 137, which seems to us of peculiar importance. The objects revealed to *faith* are not evident *in themselves*; and theologians are in the habit of explaining, by this consideration, the circumstance that men are found to reject those objects of belief. It is thus implied and taken for granted, often it is expressly said, that *intrinsic* evidence of a truth *necessitates* the intellect to its reception "evidentia cogit intellectum." But our author will not accept this statement. "Is not the existence of God evident?" he asks. And yet "thinking" men are to be found who "totally deny it." "What is more evident than the freedom and immortality of the soul? And yet these truths meet with contradiction, and obstinate contradiction."

We are a little surprised that Mgr. Laforet does not assign a more prominent place to *worldliness*, among the causes of infidelity. We are confident there is none *more* powerful, and we doubt whether there is any other so much so. God and the world form most opposite judgments on the worth of human conduct. To those who follow the latter in its view—if they are sufficiently profound thinkers to understand clearly what they are about—both Christianity and any genuine and reasonable Theism present so grotesque and incredible an appearance, that it is practically

impossible for such persons, so long as their moral standard remains unchanged, to accept such a religion as true.

We unhesitatingly recommend this volume to the study of those who are interested in the intellectual phenomena of the time.

*The Communion of Saints ; or, the Catholic Doctrine concerning our Relation to the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, and the Saints.* By WILLIAM LOCKHART, B.A., Oxon. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

*Secession or Schism.* By WILLIAM LOCKHART, B.A., Oxon. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

FATHER LOCKHART is certainly an admirable controversialist ; he does such justice to his opponents' good qualities, is so fair to their arguments, and at the same time so well versed in his own religion.

The first of the above-named pamphlets appeared several years ago ; and it is now republished with a new preface, to meet the present position of Anglicans. We have been much struck with the union of orthodoxy and moderation which F. Lockhart exhibits, in dealing with the alleged excesses of Catholic language concerning our Blessed Lady, on which Dr. Pusey has laid so much stress. F. Lockhart holds (p. vi.) that there are no "expressions in all those alleged from S. Liguori or S. Bernardine which a Catholic would misunderstand." He adds however that "the phrases are calculated to convey false impressions to Protestant Englishmen, who are usually untheological and matter of fact. . . . Italian Catholics, speaking to pious Italian Catholics, would be understood by them according to the whole tradition of Catholic faith in which they had been taught from their mother's knee ; but the same words translated into English, and read by English Protestants whose early training had not been tinged by the same accurate theology and living tradition, would most likely be misunderstood." Such misunderstanding arises "partly because English Protestants are so matter-of-fact as not to make allowance for the language of hyperbole ; and often so untheological, as not to have any clear intuition of the mystery of the Divine condescension in the Incarnation, of the union of the Godhead and Manhood in One Divine Person, of the relation of the great Mother of God to 'the Living God, who has purchased us to Himself by his own Blood,' and of the mystery of human exaltation, by which the redeemed and she who is the first and best of the redeemed, 'are seated in Heavenly places with Christ,' on that throne which He shares with His Eternal Father." In fact, F. Lockhart holds that it is English Protestants, and not foreign Catholics, who are to blame in the matter. Nay, he even considers that such is F. Newman's meaning, in a very well-known page of the letter to Dr. Pusey.

The real question at issue, adds our author (p. ix.), is whether extreme Anglicans "really mean that they are ready to accept the definition of the Council of Trent, that 'the Saints reigning with Christ intercede for us and it is good for us to invoke them.' Are they prepared to use the 'Hail Mary, the 'Salve Regina,' the litany of the Saints and of the Blessed Virgin, the

*prayers from the popular authorized Manual, the Roman Raccolta?* We may add, are they prepared to abstain from *censuring* those who dearly love the Marian language of S. Alphonsus and of Grignon de Montfort? "If so," we heartily add with F. Lockhart, "there is nothing on this point between us."

F. Lockhart's reply to Dr. Neale loses in effect, from the incredible weakness of that divine's position; still as Dr. Neale has a name among his co-religionists, it was well worth F. Lockhart's while to answer him. Dr. Neale actually "takes for granted" that the Anglican society "is allowed by Catholics to be a true Church" (p. 3). Certainly we agree with Dr. Neale, that men cannot, without mortal sin, leave a true branch of the Catholic Church. But then, as F. Lockhart amusingly observes (p. 6), this question is unpractical; for no one who accounted the Anglican denomination a true branch of the Church, could be received by any priest, or by the Pope himself, into Catholic communion.

Dr. Neale has had the boldness to say (p. 21) that converts from Anglicanism "almost without exception. . . . lead lives of more than worldly ease; give themselves up to novels, cigars, wine-parties (?); to morning lounging on the sofa, and the evening at the opera." How is one decently to characterize such language? F. Lockhart reminds his reader of the very numerous converts who have become priests. We hope however that not *quite* all *lay* converts devote *quite* their whole lives to lounging, smoking, and wine-bibbing.

---

*La Condamnation de Galilée.* Par l'Abbé D. BOUX.  
Arras : Rousseau-Leroy.

WE have long been hoping to resume the question of Galileo; on which much has been written, especially in France, since our article of October 1865. But we see no immediate hope of having an opportunity for this; and we will therefore delay no longer to bring before our readers' notice Abbé Bouix's most valuable pamphlet. This pamphlet indeed, it may be said, contains all the ecclesiastical literature of the subject, and is therefore of much utility and importance. We will state briefly, under three heads, the conclusion at which we arrived in our article; and we will consider the facts adduced by our author, in their relation thereto.

Firstly then, we stated as certain, not merely that the condemnation of Galileo was not a Pontifical *ex cathedrâ* Act, but that no contemporary Catholic imagined it so to be. In corroboration of this, we may cite Descartes's letters (Bouix, p. 21) written only six months afterwards. He thought Galileo's scientific arguments very strong (an opinion in which we believe he was quite mistaken); but declared that if the Church had condemned Heliocentrism, nothing should induce him to hold it. He proceeds to say that the condemning decree had issued primarily from the Congregations, and that he had not heard of its receiving confirmation from a Pope or Council. In like manner Caramuel (Bouix, p. 25), another contemporary of Galileo's, who himself considered Heliocentrism heretical as being con-



trary to Scripture, nevertheless took for granted, as certain on all hands, that no Pope had *ex cathedrâ* so *declared* it.

Secondly, we maintained that the decree was no doctrinal mistake at all, in any proper sense of those words ; but on the contrary, that it afforded true doctrinal guidance to contemporary Catholics, as expressing the conclusion legitimately deducible from all then cognizable data. Abbé Bouix does not go quite so far as this ; but we confess that his objections have failed to convince us. He shows very plainly (p. 60)—what we ourselves also confidently urged—how complete a mistake it is to say, that Galileo was merely condemned for professing to prove his theory from Scripture. His theory was itself condemned, as *contrary* to Scripture : and very justly, under then circumstances. It was indubitably contrary both to the one obvious, and the one then traditional, *sense* of Scripture ; and (as was repeatedly urged at the time by Galileo's opponents) nothing but complete scientific proof could have justified Catholics in giving the words of Scripture a figurative interpretation. F. Fabri, S.J., a strong anti-Galilean, is quoted by our author (pp. 30, 31) as expressly saying, that if a scientific demonstration of Copernicanism were ever discovered, the Church would not hesitate to sanction a figurative interpretation of Scripture ; but adding, that he for one did not at all expect such a demonstration *could* be given. It is now indeed admitted by all, that Galileo's opponents were perfectly right in demurring to his alleged proofs, and that those proofs were utterly insufficient : some even think, that the said proofs were so weak as to be almost worthless. Galileo's scientific achievements were undoubtedly very considerable indeed ; but his reasonings for Copernicanism are rather discreditable than otherwise to his scientific character.

Abbé Bouix urges indeed (p. 57), that Nicholas of Cusa, Copernicus, and others, had been permitted to maintain Heliocentrism. As to the former however, there is no reason whatever for supposing that his (at the time) eccentric and isolated opinion was ever brought at all under the notice of ecclesiastical authority. And as to Copernicus, he declared most expressly in his preface that he spoke of Heliocentrism as a pure hypothesis ; the imagination of which was useful for the calculation of planetary orbits, but which “need not be true or even probable,” i. e., resting on any solid ground whatever. De Morgan adds that every one of Copernicus's followers down to Galileo, with one single exception, understood and followed him in the same sense.

We believe then, that Paul V. and the Roman Congregations did very important service to the Church and to religion, by checking Galileo's reckless and anti-Catholic career.

Thirdly, we expressed an opinion that contemporary Catholics were under a real obligation of yielding interior assent to the congregational decree ; though of course not that absolute and unreserved assent, which is due to an infallible judgment. We illustrated the nature of the assent, by referring to a youth of fourteen years old, instructed by his father whose character he has every reason for respecting, in the facts and principles of history. He accepts the whole instruction with unqualified assent ; nor does the very thought of its being erroneous in any one particular so much as enter his

mind: and yet he knows that it is not infallible. Abbé Bouix speaks here and there, as though no interior assent could be due to a fallible decree; but we think he can hardly have given the matter deliberate consideration.

Abbé Bouix has conferred signal services on the Church, and is among the most learned, orthodox, and universally respected of theologians. He has added another conspicuous good work in the present important pamphlet. All who are interested in the Galileo question, should read it in close connection with M. de l'Epinois's contribution on the same subject, in the 5th livraison of the *Revue des Sciences Historiques*. This latter paper was noticed by us in October, 1867, p. 535.

---

*Revue Catholique*, November, 1868. Louvain: Verbeist.

WE understand from the *Tablet* that this excellently principled periodical is to assume a larger and more important shape; and we are heartily glad to hear it. At present we would merely draw our readers' attention to part of a very important letter, addressed by Card. Caterini, Prefect of the Congregation of the Council of Trent, to the bishop of a certain canon, who had refused to accept the Church's doctrine on the moral necessity of the Pope's temporal dominion. The whole letter is well worthy of attentive perusal, the more so as the *Revue* mentions that it received the Holy Father's approbation; but our immediate concern is with one particular paragraph. The italics are our own.

"In favour of this dominion are to be found not only *Allocutions and Encyclicals* of Holy Fathers, but letters also from almost all the bishops of the Catholic world. What could be more easy for him, on seeing all these documents, than to reason thus? 'The Roman Pontiff and the bishops, or in other words the entire Catholic Church, *teaches me this*: why should I not listen to her voice? If I listen not to the Church, I shall without any doubt incur the tremendous anathema declared in Scripture, 'If he listens not to the Church, let him be to thee as a publican and a heathen.' When the Pope speaks, who is *the Universal Teacher* and vicegerent of Jesus Christ, who would dare to resist and refuse to 'bring his intellect into captivity,' even though one might not understand the whole bearing of his language nor the motives of his directions [prescriptions]? It is true that in the present matter *there is no question of an article which appertains directly to the Faith*; but *is that sufficient ground for refusing due submission to the voice of the Supreme Pastor?* Who does not know that, besides what are strictly called articles of faith, *there are others also which concern the Faith*; and that there are also moral precepts; as that, for instance, which forbids theft?" (p. 652).

The Cardinal Prefect therefore places the Catholic's obligation of accepting the Church's doctrine concerning the Pope's civil sovereignty, on the very same level with his obligation of accepting her doctrine on the sinfulness of theft.

The *Revue Catholique* itself speaks in a similar sense.

"But the question of the suitableness and necessity of this temporal dominion is a question of doctrine the solution of which appertains to the Church. It is true that she has not defined this doctrine as appertaining directly to the Faith, as a dogma properly so called. Still that is no sufficient ground that we can

dispense ourselves from adhering to her decisions. It is not only what are strictly called articles of faith which we are bound to admit. *The Church is also infallible* when she *defines* a doctrine . . . . declaring that this doctrine . . . . \* has relation to the general good of religion, to her rights or her discipline, even though otherwise her decision might appear to have, or might really have, *no direct connection with a dogma of faith or rule of morals*. Now this is what she has done as to the civil Princedom of the Holy See.

---

*Pensées de M. Louis Veuillot, recueillies de tous ses Ouvrages.*  
Par l'Abbé CHARBONNEL.

**W**E have not yet seen this volume ; but we hasten to reprint, from the *Westminster Gazette* of Dec. 19, a translation of Mgr. Mercurelli's letter expressing the Holy Father's warm approval of it.

"Our Most Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., has observed with great satisfaction that you have occupied yourself with disposing in order, and giving to the world, a new arrangement of the ideas of the illustrious writer, M. Louis Veuillot, on the Church, religion, and ethics, and other subjects relating to religious and civil society, particularly history, and the pernicious errors which abound in the world in our day.

"Within the limits of a moderate volume you have succeeded in affording a splendid specimen of the talent and piety of your author. Those whose occupations preclude them from studying all his numerous works, have the advantage in your work of finding themselves provided, without the trouble of searching them out, with the solid arguments M. Veuillonthas so frequently furnished, both for sustaining belief and for refuting the sophisms and pretensions of unbelievers ; and no less for exposing the fallacy of the opinions, with which it is now sought to undermine the religious foundations of society.

"Our Holy Father congratulates you therefore on your useful undertaking, and in token of his approval and paternal goodwill towards you, sends his Apostolic Benediction.

"And for my part, after thus fulfilling my instructions concerning you, I hasten to offer you the hearty expression of my esteem and regard, as well as good wishes for the success of your work, praying our Lord to grant you His favour."

It is well known that M. Veuillot is the leading opponent (in the press) of French "liberal Catholicism." And it is those very works of his, singled out by Pius IX. for approbation, concerning "religious and civil society" and "the opinions with which it is now sought to undermine *the religious foundations of society*," wherein he has principally assailed that unsound and Anti-Catholic system.

We think it is comparatively very seldom, that the Holy Father expresses praise so unreserved of any publication, as he has done of the present ; and again as he expressed of M. de Beaulieu's reply to M. de Montalembert's doctrine, about a "free Church in a free state."

---

\* The words omitted are (1), "or when she imposes a law ;" (2), "or law." We do not quite apprehend their meaning ; for no one maintains that every enacted by the Church is infallibly expedient.

The *Month* for November, 1868. London : Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

**T**HE "Month" is a periodical of very different stamp indeed from the "Home and Foreign Review," or the "Chronicle"; and its judgment has justly great weight with the Catholic body. It has rendered much service; but for that very reason it has the power of doing serious mischief by any inaccurate or unguarded statement. It was on this account, that we felt under an obligation in our last number of drawing the Editor's attention to a very singular proposition indeed, which appeared in his August issue: "the Church does not assume, and never has assumed, any power to discern and proclaim truths altogether unknown to the Church of the Apostles."

The Editor now confirms our previous strong impression, that he never intended to sanction this proposition in its obvious and grammatical sense. So understood indeed, it is not only false, but most unsound and mischievous. A small knot of extreme theologians have adopted it, for the purpose of denying the Church's infallibility in her minor censures; in the "Unigenitus," the "Auctorem Fidei," the condemnation of Fénelon: while the Jansenists maintained it very prominently, as their defence for not submitting to the Church's judgment on a dogmatical fact. The Editor of the "Month" has, of course, no kind of sympathy with such a tenet; and even under ordinary circumstances we should expect he would have been grateful to us for giving him the opportunity of explanation. But in the present state of things,—this very question having been of late so fully and prominently discussed and so much stress laid on it,—we really think that his words would have been widely considered as a pointed declaration on what he himself accounts the unorthodox side. And this the rather, because he has hitherto felt it his duty, for reasons which he has now assigned, to give no opinion on the recent controversy. He now expresses, as we anticipated he would, a distinct judgment (p. 517) that "the Church speaks infallibly," not only on dogmatical facts, but also on "what are called 'deducible' and 'protective' truths." We are very happy indeed to accept the penalty of what we may call a severe scolding at his hands, as the price we pay for the advantage derived to orthodoxy from his distinct profession of doctrine.

We cannot assent to any of his various criticisms, either on our notice of October, or on our previous course of conduct. But we will rather take some opportunity of indirectly replying to them, than do any thing which could be understood as assuming an antagonistic attitude towards his periodical.

He says indeed, in effect, that our criticism of his notice was malevolent.\* We are a little surprised at his thinking this. We have gone out of our way

---

\* We understand this charge to be conveyed in the following sentence:—"The critic in one place, where he speaks of the possible malevolence of others, has been so *careless* as to change the word 'altogether' into the word 'generally'" (p. 517).

As we have had to recite this sentence, we may as well rectify our contemporary's misapprehension. We did not at all misquote him. Our meaning

on various occasions to express our sense of the services rendered by him to the Church ; nor, before our last number, have we ever said one word expressing even difference of opinion, much less disparagement. Even in the notice on which he is remarking, we speak of the "excellent service he has done" by his various "comments on Anglican orders," and proceed to enlarge on the great merit of his last article on the subject. We assure him that nothing can be further from our wish than any disunion between him and ourselves. We regard him as a fellow labourer, not an opponent. The "Month" and the "Dublin Review" are engaged in the same cause, and pursuing the same ends. That there should be occasional differences of judgment between the two is natural, indeed inevitable ; but these differences concern not ends, but means. It shall not be our fault, if the good cause suffers by dissension arising between its upholders.

---

*National Tendencies and the Duty of Catholics.* By HERBERT VAUGHAN, D.D. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

THIS pamphlet cannot properly be made by us a matter of comment, as it is but a reprint of an article in our number for July, 1868. F. Vaughan prefaces the re-issue by this introduction.

"The following pages are reprinted and given to the public in a cheap form, not because they claim any literary merit—far from it—but because they treat of the two subjects which are the most vital to the English people : our Educational and Religious National Tendencies.

"With regard to POPULAR EDUCATION, I wish to lay before the Catholic public a consideration on the importance of *at once* setting to work to form 'District Poor School Committees.'

"And, with regard to the purely RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT, I am glad of an opportunity to call attention to the fact that, since this article was written, a '*Catholic Truth Society*' has actually been established, and is on the eve of opening its central depôt, for the sale and distribution of popular fly-sheets, papers, and pamphlets, at No. 27, Wellington-street, Strand, W.C.

"Lastly, while so much nonsense has been talked about women and their rights, it is worth while to suggest whether their highest and noblest mission is not direct co-operation with Our Lord and His Apostles in moulding the masses to Christianity, and drawing them to eternal life.

"It is Our Lord Himself who, through His Church, in which His Divine Spirit is abiding, freed and frees, raised and raises women to their proper position in the world. Through His Church He has been their Educator and Protector, and through His Church He organizes them to minister to all the spiritual and corporal needs of society, in every age, with the same Divine wisdom and mercy, as He established, for woman as well as for man, that indissoluble sacramental bond, which men nowadays annul and repudiate by Act of Parliament."

---

was simply this. We had no right to assume that the Apostles knew *none* of those "deducible" and "protective" truths which the Church has from time to time infallibly determined since their death : but it seemed safe to say that those truths were "*generally*"—i.e. that *most* of them were—"unknown"—i.e. *altogether* unknown—to the Apostles. To have added the word "*altogether*," instead of impairing in any way our argument, would but have exhibited it more clearly.

*A Chapter of Autobiography.* By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.  
London : Murray.

THIS pamphlet is calculated greatly to raise Mr. Gladstone's character in the estimation of those who (like ourselves) can feel no respect for a public man, except so far as he brings his religious convictions to bear intimately on his political conduct. There were various indications, which led some to fear that Mr. Gladstone had broken with his past life altogether, and had plunged unreservedly into the vortex of secular party politics. It is delightful then to find so accomplished a statesman keeping up so heartily his theological interests, and holding as firmly as ever to the great principle, that promotion of a people's religious welfare is at least one prominent end to be pursued by its civil rulers. Some Protestant politicians may be led to press forward Irish disestablishment, by their detestable wish to sever politics from religion ; but Mr. Gladstone's reasons for the measure which he has originated, are reasons with which, so far as they go, the best-instructed Catholic will heartily concur.

"In every function of life, and in every combination with his fellow-creatures, for whatever purpose, the duties of man are limited only by his powers. It is easy to separate, in the case of a Gas Company or a Chess Club, the primary end for which it exists, from everything extraneous to that end. It is not so easy in the case of the State or of the family. If the primary end of the State is to protect life and property, so the *primary end of the family is to propagate the race*. But around these ends there cluster, in both cases, a group of moral purposes, variable indeed with varying circumstances, but yet *inhering in the relation*, and not external or merely incidental to it. *The action of man in the State is moral, as truly as it is in the individual sphere* ; although it be limited by the fact that, as he is combined with others whose views and wills may differ from his own, the sphere of the common operations must be limited, first, to the things in which all are agreed ; secondly, to the things in which, though they may not be agreed, yet equity points out, and the public sense acknowledges, that the whole should be bound by the sense of the majority.

"I can hardly believe that even those, including as they do so many men both upright and able, who now contend on principle for the separation of the Church from the State, are so determined to exalt their theorem to the place of an universal truth, that they ask us to condemn the whole of that process, by which, as the Gospel spread itself through the civilized world, Christianity became incorporated with the action of civil authority, and with the framework of public law " (pp. 58, 59).

The admirable illustration drawn, in this extract, from the "primary end of the family," is one which we have never before seen introduced into controversies about Church and State ; though it is so singularly apposite and cogent, that one wonders how it can hitherto have been passed over.

It was Lord Macaulay's shallow and even preposterous doctrine, that a government may occasionally indeed give a lift to the spiritual welfare of its subjects ; but only so far as such little incidental excursions from its province shall not interfere with the slightest temporal benefit. This theory, says Mr. Gladstone,

"may be comprised in three words : Government is police. All other functions, except those of police proper, are the accidents of its existence.



*As if a man should say to his friend when in the country, 'I am going up to town; can I take anything for you?' So the State, while busy about protecting life and property, will allow its officer of police to perform any useful office for the community, to instruct a wayfarer as to his road, or tell the passer-by what o'clock it is, provided it does not interfere with his watching the pickpocket, or laying the strong hand upon the assassin" (p. 57).*

On the other hand, how inadequate have been even the highest Tractarian theories on Church and State, is signally manifested in other passages of this pamphlet. The very notion that in matters which have a religious bearing God has subjected State to Church, and not the reverse,—has never apparently occurred to Mr. Gladstone, even as an hypothesis. Witness the following:—

*"As long as the Church at large, or the Church within the limits of the nation, is substantially one, I do not see why the religious care of the subject, through a body properly constituted for the purpose, should cease to be a function of the State, with the whole action and life of which it has, throughout Europe, been so long and so closely associated. As long as the State holds, by descent, by the intellectual superiority of the governing classes, and by the good will of the people, a position of original and underived authority, there is no absolute impropriety, but the reverse, in its commending to the nation the greatest of all boons" (p. 60).*

Again in p. 14 the author implies that, where Church and State are in their normal condition, the latter is not simply to accept dogma from the former, but, on the contrary, is itself to "take cognizance of religious truth and error."

Still, as we have said, the general principles of this autobiography, on the connection between religion and politics, are in the highest degree honourable to one who is playing so prominent a part in the political world; and the more so, as he cannot expect that they will increase his influence with his own party. They are in fact precisely identical with those very principles which he has been accused of deserting, the principles expressed in his excellent work on "The State in its Relations with the Church."

Vast numbers of critics have described as the one distinguishing characteristic of that work—many as its distinguishing paradox—its author's allegation that the State has a conscience. What a marvellous criticism! To say that the State has *not* a conscience, is to say that the State in its corporate capacity is not bound by the moral law: and is this then the doctrine upholden by Mr. Gladstone's censors? As he most truly observe, (p. 14), "the controversy lies not in the *existence* of a conscience in the State," but "in the *extent* of its range."

But if Mr. Gladstone's principles on the State's duty towards religion are the same now which they were in his youth, how are we to account for his singular practical change about the Irish Establishment? Three chief reasons are assigned by him for this change.

1. In his youth he extravagantly overrated the doctrinal unity, the doctrinal stability, the predominance, the influence, of the Anglican denomination (pp. 50–56). Little did he dream, e. g., that in ten or twelve years,

*"at least a moiety of the most gifted sons whom Oxford had reared for the service of the Church of England, would be hurling at her head the hottest bolts of the Vatican: that, with their deviation on the one side, there would arise a not less convulsive rationalistic movement on the other; and that the natural consequences would be developed in endless contention and*

estrangement, and in suspicions worse than either, because even less accessible, and even more intractable. Since that time, the Church of England may be said to have bled at every pore" (pp. 54, 55).

2. In England the Government has come rather "to be the organ of the deliberate and ascertained will of the community, expressed through legal channels" (p. 60), than a power governing that community: and consequently it is less at liberty to inculcate on the people its own religious convictions. This change from the old state of things was no doubt in progress when Mr. Gladstone wrote his work, but he had not duly observed it. He evidently sympathizes with the change far more cordially than we can pretend to do. Indeed he professes political Liberalism, and we are very far from professing it.

3. But even had the Anglican denomination been far more influential than it is in England, and had the relations between English governors and governed remained as they were, what possible right had England to thrust its heretical Establishment upon Catholic Ireland? What superiority of nature and cultivation do the English possess over the Irish, which can offer any pretext for the former governing the latter on the very principles on which they govern the Hindoos in India and the negroes in Jamaica? What more shameful abuse can there be, than that Ireland should be ruled, not according to Irish, but according to English ideas? We have been a good deal surprised at not finding such topics enforced in the present pamphlet; but Mr. Gladstone's recent electioneering speeches abound with reiterations of this important truth.

We do not ourselves see any objection whatever in *principle*, though Mr. Gladstone (p. 22) apparently sees one, to the State pecuniarily assisting different religious bodies at the same time. But the evils of such an arrangement between England and Ireland would be frightful. Assistance of this kind would be unintermittingly made a plea for the most tyrannical State interference with the Church's discipline, nay, with her doctrine. In fact, Dean Stanley and other prominent advocates of the project base their proposal on this very ground; they avow their wish of using State agency, to repress the growth of what they call "Ultramontaniam" in Ireland. There is no plan against which the whole Irish Catholic body, bishops, priests, and people, are more resolutely determined, than against any imaginable offer of State subsidy to the parish priests.

In p. 33 Mr. Gladstone speaks admirably on "the burning shame and hideous scandal of those penal laws" in Ireland "which perhaps *for the first time in the history of Christendom, if not of man*, aimed at persecuting men out of one religion, but *not at persecuting them into another*."

In taking leave of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, we may express our sincere trust that Catholic Irishmen, while they follow their Protestant leader in his onslaught on the detestable Irish Establishment, will not fall below that leader in those politico-religious principles, which they shall profess as their rule of action. We sincerely trust that the Holy Father's reiterated and emphatic protests against the severance of politics from religion, will not meet with a less harmonious response from any of his own spiritual children, than they meet with from one who is still alas! a stranger to the true fold.

*Is there not a Cause?* By REV. M. MACCOLL, M.A. London: Longmans.

WE frankly admit that Mr. MacColl has taken us completely by surprise, in the extraordinary vigour and freshness of this pamphlet. It is plain he is incomparably better fitted to deal with these semi-political questions, than with theology and philosophy. Indeed, in the present pamphlet itself, he seems bent on making this evident; for in p. 102, he lugs in, by the head and shoulders, a little theological episode, in which his remarks are as curiously feeble as they are curiously *mal-à-propos*. He is also led incidentally to theologize on the State's legitimate power, and he certainly goes extraordinary lengths:—

“It belongs (he says) to the essence of the State that it should possess *supreme and unlimited power* over all its component members in respect both to *their persons and properties*; and the State *itself is the sole judge* how far it is *just* to exercise its undoubted right. Moreover, in a free country, the State is, in idea, *incapable of acting wrongfully* towards its members, because the governing power is supposed to represent the collective wisdom of the nation.”

But the pamphlet, as a whole, seems to us the very best we have seen on Irish Disestablishment; and we only regret that it does not give a table of contents. Ireland, such is our author's view and such is our own, has been treated with shameful injustice by England, from the time of Henry II.; still, matters were tending to harmony and amalgamation, when the hateful Reformation came in to blight the fair prospect (pp. 3, 4). Mr. Gathorne Hardy indeed says, that it is the Irish mind which has been poisoned against England, and his party cheers the disgraceful statement. Such a suggestion almost drives the author (p. 6) to despair of ever seeing the Irish question settled peaceably. He takes indeed high ground:—

“I maintain (he says) that England has no right whatever to decree the union with Ireland ‘inseparable for ever’ unless she is prepared to grant the remedy which Ireland is willing to accept in lieu of separation. We see this clearly enough in the case of foreign countries. Venetia was ceded to Italy with the acclamation of England. The two Houses of Parliament in 1863 gave their moral support to Poland in the agony of its struggle to shake off the Muscovite yoke. England hailed with satisfaction the downfall of the Bourbon dynasty in Southern Italy, and would rejoice to see Rome become the capital of a united Italy. . . . And yet we feel surprised and indignant, and think our national honour outraged, if some foreign journalist or orator ventures to express sympathy with the wrongs of Ireland. I repeat, we have to show cause why the Union should be ‘inseparable for ever;’ and no cause can be shown so long as England persists in refusing what Ireland has been alternately praying and fighting for all these weary years. No country has the indefeasible right, which Lord Stanley contends for, of keeping another country tied to it for ever, and at the same time refusing the reasonable terms which the subject country offers to accept as the condition of the Union.”

“I will go so far as to say that the Irish people *ought not to be loyal to England* while they are thus affronted and outraged in the tenderest and holiest feelings of the human heart.”

This is the language of common sense and common justice. Let the English settle the Establishment question and the land question in an Irish sense, or else let them cease from their hypocritical pretence of sympathy with oppressed nationalities.

Our author discusses excellently (pp. 193—199) the objection to Disestablishment, which is founded on the rights of property. Such an objection, at all events, comes with the worst possible grace from Lord Derby, who proposes a new division of the spoil among Protestants. For such a statesman to talk about the rights of property being involved is much the same thing, says Mr. MacColl, as though he were to say that the rights of property would be violated indeed by Knowsley being *confiscated*, but not violated by its division among all the members of the Stanley family.

To the amazement of all reasonable men, the obsolete argument has been disinterred about the Coronation Oath, and it is admirably answered by Mr. MacColl, from p. 53 to p. 62. Among other things, he exposes the absurdity of imagining that this oath was enacted by the nation, not to fetter *the monarch's* action, but to fetter *its own*;—to prevent itself from repairing, during any given reign, what it may have discovered to be an injustice. Even if the oath *did* involve this however, what then? Suppose a robber solemnly swears that for ten years he will make no restitution of his plunder, do the Tories say that he would offend God by breaking such an oath?

Fresh ramifications of this disestablishment question are sure to spring up; and we hope Mr. MacColl will not be wanting to the occasions as they arise.

---

*The Life and Writings of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary.* By the Rev. M. B. BUCKLEY, Roman Catholic Curate, SS. Peter and Paul's, Cork. Duffy: Dublin and London.

FATHER O'LEARY was a very able, a very eminent, and, on the whole, we may say, with certain reservations, a very good man. These islands had certainly no greater or more conspicuous figure among the Catholics of his time. Lady Morgan calls him "the Catholic Swift." All the great Irishmen of those days—Yelverton, Curran, Grattan, Burke—were his attached personal friends. The "Monks of the Screw" admitted him to the exceptional privileges of honorary membership. The "Irish Brigade" of the Volunteers conferred on him the dignity of honorary chaplain, and received him, when he attended the Convention of November, 1783, with a full salute from the entire guard. He was no less esteemed in England, not only by his fellow-Catholics, but by Protestants of the greatest worth and eminence. John Wesley, whom he had controversially thrashed, was desirous to meet him, and pleased when they had met. John Howard, the prison reformer, was proud to be his friend. He was a welcome guest in the very first society, and his intimacy with the Prince of Wales (afterwards George IV.) gave some colour to the rumour, however false, that it was he who had performed the marriage ceremony between His Royal

Highness and Mrs. Fitzherbert. Two men of his country, his faith, and his profession, finding in the combined disadvantages of being priests and Irishmen insurmountable obstacles to the worldly ambition which they were unable to control, renounced their faith and their vows, and became respectively Dean of Killala and Bishop of Meath. But, even in this world, they did not receive the reward of O'Leary; who, a plain "Popish friar" to the last, attained much higher social eminence and much wider public influence than either Kirwan or O'Beirne.

Such a man could not be quite forgotten amongst us, even though he had wanted the *vate sacro*. But in an age when a bulky and closely-printed catalogue appears every year, as a necessary record of the distinguished merits of these who are pleased to consider themselves the "Men of the Time," the men of another time can hardly hold their own. We cannot withhold, then, our general approval from the object Mr. Buckley had in view, when he undertook to write the life of Father O'Leary. It is true the worthy Franciscan had already found a biographer, and not a bad one either, in the Rev. T. R. England (the "Father Tom" of *Proul's* "Town of Passage"), brother of the celebrated Bishop of Charleston. Mr. England's work, however, has long been out of print; and, though there are not very many new facts that we can perceive in Mr. Buckley's, his right to produce an original work on the subject is indisputable. The plan of his volume is novel and not convenient. We could imagine him bringing out a new and complete, or, if not complete, a select edition of O'Leary's writings. To this an introductory memoir might have been appropriately prefixed. But not less than half, we should say, of this volume consists of extracts from the writings—very copious extracts, necessarily—which break up the continuity and flow of the narrative in a way that is rather disagreeable. We hope it will not be tedious to our readers if, taking the principal facts of O'Leary's history substantially as Mr. Buckley gives them, we present them in a concise and summary form.

Arthur O'Leary was born, in 1729, near Dunmanway, in the county of Cork. His humble parents gave him, illegally, the limited amount of education which it was possible for him to receive in the wilds of Munster from proscribed Catholic teachers; and, at the age of eighteen, aspiring to the priesthood, he went to France, where, at S. Malo's, he entered the convent of the Capuchins and, in due time, received ordination. If his profession had been other than the religious, the pursuit of it under such difficulties would probably have made him disaffected towards the laws and authorities in despite of which it had to be reached. Between 1756 and 1763 many British prisoners of war were in custody at S. Malo's. Even then the British "line" was largely (though against the law) composed of Irish soldiers, and the prisoners at S. Malo's were, for the most part, Irish Catholics.\* Their countryman, O'Leary, was appointed to minister to their spiritual wants, and they never forgot the zeal and charity with which he

---

\* The regiments to which they belonged had been raised by Lord Chesterfield to fight against Charles Edward.

served them. To his influence it was owing that the efforts of the Duc de Choiseul to make them desert the English service for the French—in other words, the service of cruel Protestant taskmasters for that of kind Catholic hosts—were unavailing. In 1771, he came to Cork, being then forty-two years old. Twenty-seven years before, Lord Chesterfield (finding, as he said, that the only “dangerous Papists” in the kingdom were two young ladies, named Devereux, whom he had seen at Castle balls—finding, also, that the endeavours of the poor Catholics to worship God in secret, in crazy lofts and garrets, were attended with serious accidents to life and limb) had removed the interdict upon Catholic worship previously enforced. O’Leary’s first work in Cork was to help in the erection of a chapel, known for many years as the “Little Friary,” and celebrated also as the scene of Father Mathew’s early labours. Here his style of preaching soon attracted attention, and drew to hear him persons of every religious denomination. He had not been long in Cork when he was induced to take up his pen in defence of religious truth against the attacks of a sceptical Scotchman, named Blair, who practised as a physician in that city. Blair had produced a book entitled “Thoughts on Nature and Religion,” in which, with some amount of literary cleverness, he brought together a number of the current objections of French philosophers against the truth of Christianity, and supplemented them with some peculiar theories of his own. Weak and ridiculous in many respects as this production was, it made a great sensation in Cork. “Cork,” says Mr. Buckley, “was not then the Athens of Ireland.” We are not aware that it is even now; but, Athens or Thebes, there were not a few sinners in the place, young and old, whom Dr. Blair’s book encouraged in their evil habits and armed with a show of reasoning against received doctrine and morality. The clergy took the alarm. A member of the Establishment (as it was thought), not being strong in logic or theology, assailed the work in scurrilous rhyme, but soon found that he was not such an auxiliary or such a champion as the time required. An Anabaptist minister made the matter still worse, for “his production was even more sceptical than that which he pretended to answer.” At last O’Leary was urged to enter the field, but, though ready enough for the encounter, there was an obstacle in the way, in the danger to which his position as a priest and a religious exposed him if he published anything at all. It was only after having obtained the sanction of Dr. Mann, the Protestant bishop of the diocese, that he ventured to take up his pen, and produced in a series of four letters a defence of our Lord’s divinity, and of the immortality of the soul.

Those letters, from which he gives but a few extracts, seem to Mr. Buckley unsuited to the taste of the present day. He objects, somewhat hypercritically and unjustly, as we think, to the “scholastic style of the argumentation,” of which, with all of them before us, we can discover but few traces. On the contrary, we know no work of that period of which the style is easier or more elegant, rising often into a high and impressive eloquence; pointed often by a telling epigram; though, no doubt, occasionally characterized, if not disfigured, by an unseasonable burst of humour, apparently irrepressible, and thoroughly Irish. Even this may be excused on the ground that ridicule was the best weapon, after all, to employ against such an



antagonist, and that O'Leary unquestionably succeeded in raising a hearty laugh at his expense. We advert thus particularly to this point here, because there are other passages of O'Leary's writings to which we shall refer before we have done, which we think Mr. Buckley might have more judiciously left out.

Whatever may be thought of the literary merit of this first publication of O'Leary's, its practical effect was conclusive. If it did not satisfy Mr. Blair that his soul was immortal, it proved, at least, the mortality of his body, for it killed him. He probably little expected to find the truth of the Voltairean maxim, *le ridicule tue*, exemplified in his own person. The next occasion on which Father O'Leary took up his pen was in vindication of the Test Oath,—a form in which Catholics were graciously permitted to “testify their allegiance” to the Crown, by virtue of an Act of the Irish Parliament passed in 1774. This is not the place for discussing the points at issue between those ecclesiastics who, like Archbishop Butler, of Cashel, unreservedly approved the oath, and those who, like Bishop Burke, of Ossory, strongly condemned it. There was also a third party, which, with Archbishop Carpenter, of Dublin, took a middle course. The first party was that with which O'Leary sided. And we will only say that his ultra-Gallican restrictions of the Papal authority, his flings at Bellarmine as a “bigoted divine, bristling with barbarous Latin,” his flippant query whether “an Irish Catholic must starve because an Italian wrote nonsense in bad Latin two hundred years ago ;” his implied if not avowed sympathy with all the contumacious, schismatical, and heretical sovereigns who had resisted the authority of the Holy See,—all these things were of no effect at all in disposing parliaments, or ministers, or monarchs towards Catholic emancipation. Yorktown and Valmy were far more efficient in that work in his own time than anything he said and did, or could say and do. Some allowance, however, has to be made for his French education, and for the formation of his theological and political opinions under the influence of a school which most unwarrantably extended the limits of the civil power, and gave Cæsar a good deal more than his due.

A few years after, in 1779, he wrote a short and simple, but forcible “Address to the Common People,” with reference to an apprehended French invasion.

In 1780, John Wesley, wishing to strengthen the hands of Lord George Gordon, published some letters on the Catholic question. “With persecution,” said Wesley, “I have nothing to do ; I persecute no man for his religious principles.” But he added in the same breath, “I insist upon it that no Government, not Roman Catholic, ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.” He sought to justify this singular position by imputing to Catholics, on the assumed authority of the Council of Constance, the doctrine that no faith was to be kept with heretics. O'Leary hastened to join issue with him, and pointed out very clearly that the conduct of the Council in the case of Huss did not justify the imputation. He appealed to the practical evidence afforded by the existing condition of the Irish Catholics, who might easily by perjuring themselves (which, according to Wesley, they were sure to do) have escaped the operation of the Penal Laws and come at once into the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens.

Arguing that "every church claims to herself the power of inflicting spiritual punishments independent of the civil magistrate," he adduced, with comical effect, a case in which Wesley himself had inflicted a punishment of the kind upon a certain Mrs. Williamson, of Georgia, for the peculiar offence of having given her hand in preference to Mr. Williamson, a layman, "at a time when the clergyman intended to light Hymen's torch with a spark of grace." For this Wesley refused her the Lord's Supper, and was thereupon cited before the magistrates. His defence was that his act "being a matter purely ecclesiastic, he could not acknowledge their power to interrogate him upon it."\* The whole controversy was conducted on O'Leary's side with great force of reasoning and an overflow of the raciest humour, but, we are sorry to add, in a spirit inconsistent with even the most moderate respect for the authority and independence of the Holy See. Soon after this he wrote his famous Essay on Toleration; which Mr. Buckley reprints in full, and introduces with expressions of unqualified praise. It would be an ungracious task (which we are not at present able or willing to impose on ourselves) to point out the passages in this essay to which exception should be taken on theological grounds. We will only say that they are not few and, while there are some things in the essay with which we agree, there are other propositions from which we are bound most emphatically to dissent.

We should here add that, like so many others who have advocated "liberty of conscience" as a *principle*, Father O'Leary seems to have been infected in no slight degree with the poison of *indifferentism*. At the same time, in the case of similar writers, it is often very difficult to know whether this or that passage expresses their permanent and habitual *conviction*, or only an opinion which at the moment of writing they persuade themselves that they hold.

There can be no doubt, however, that it was this publication which raised O'Leary to the height of popularity and influence on which he stood for many years. Besides the honours paid him by the "Monks of the Screw" and the Volunteers, to which we have already referred, the English Catholic Committee had a hundred copies of the work printed at their own expense, which they presented in his name to several of the most distinguished men of the day. The Government of the day were eager to avail themselves of the aid of so powerful a pen, and employed an envoy to engage O'Leary's services in furtherance of some measures which they had just brought forward in Parliament. But these overtures were indignantly rejected. He did not refuse, however, the offer of an unconditional pension from the Crown of £150 a year, in acknowledgement of the services which he was admitted to have already rendered the State. A change of ministry prevented this arrangement from coming into effect.

We cannot linger upon some minor discussions in which he was engaged; in a successful effort to hinder a weak design of suppressing the religious orders then existing in Ireland, and in defending the character of his brother Franciscan, Clement XIV., against the accusations of Father

---

\* This passage is not given by Mr. Buckley.

Carroll, S.J., afterwards the first Catholic bishop in the United States. He took an influential part in suppressing a very remarkable conspiracy in which the peasantry of parts of the south of Ireland had united at the instigation of "Captain Right," the object of which was not only to obtain the redress of political grievances and a mitigation of the oppressive form in which tithes were levied, but also to define and limit the offerings made to the Catholic clergy on certain occasions. In the confusion of ideas caused by the agitation of these questions, numbers of the common people, supposing that external conformity to the religion of the State would exempt them from the punishment to which their acts of violence had rendered them liable, and also authorize them to bear the arms with which the hands of their Protestant neighbours were strengthened, were to be seen, Sunday after Sunday, flocking to public worship in the Protestant churches, and were to be heard modifying the ordinances of the English Book of Common Prayer by an energetic recitation of the Rosary in Irish. In connection with these proceedings, as well as on account of some writings in which Dr. Woodward, the Protestant Bishop of Cloyne, endeavoured to excite public odium against the Catholic clergy, O'Leary vigorously attacked that prelate; and with such effect that his lordship was brought in a short time not only to do justice to his opponent, but also to counsel his clergy to maintain a cordial intercourse with the Roman Catholic clergy of their respective parishes, and to vie with them in promoting "piety, good morals, and public order and charity."

Soon afterwards, in 1789, Father O'Leary left Ireland, and came upon the London mission. He was at first one of the chaplains of the Spanish embassy, in which position Dr. Hussey, afterwards Bishop of Waterford, was one of his colleagues. Subsequently, when what is now well known as S. Patrick's, in Sutton-street, Soho, was converted from an assembly-room into a place of Catholic worship under his auspices, he was appointed to it by Bishop Douglas, and made it the centre of his missionary duties until shortly before his death, when failing health compelled him to relinquish labour. His reputation as a speaker and a writer being by this time well established, his sermons were generally heard by crowded audiences, which always included a number of Protestants. We have been told by one of the seniors of the London clergy, who had himself heard it from O'Leary's contemporaries, that he had a great objection to give up his place in the pulpit to others; "because," he shrewdly said, "if they preach better than I do, the people will afterwards have less satisfaction in hearing me; and if they don't preach as well, I shall not be thanked for having brought them." Special mention is made of a sermon preached by him in behalf of the French refugees whom the Revolution had driven in crowds to England, and of a panegyric on Pius VI., preached at the Requiem High Mass celebrated at S. Patrick's for the repose of that Pontiff's soul on the 16th of November, 1799; in presence of Monsignor (afterwards Cardinal) Erskine, Dillon, Archbishop of Narbonne, and a large number of the English nobility and exiled French aristocracy. It does not seem to us that his style improved with years. It was easier, and even, so to speak, more English, when he was fresh from France than it became after he had long enjoyed the society

and conversation of the best speakers and writers of his day. We account for this by the supposition that his earlier style must have been formed on better models than his later. Whatever his success in the pulpit, his success in society was immeasurably greater. An "easy humour, blossoming like the thousand flowers of spring," a wit ever ready and keen, but never bitter,—these were the charming qualities, united to the treasures of a well-stored mind, which the great and the gifted could appreciate, and which made him welcome to all. Mr. Buckley condescends to reproduce (though under protest) some of his best recorded sayings. Having himself enjoyed the rare and enviable opportunities of hearing "by chance, at dinner-parties, better things said than have ever been published," Mr. Buckley is unable to discover any "reason why the witticisms of remarkable men should be made subjects of special commemoration."

O'Leary's last work, which appeared in 1800, an "Address to the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal," touches again upon some of the points treated by him in his letters to Wesley and his Essay on Toleration. In it he expresses his approval of the Union, as a measure calculated in his opinion to heal the wounds of his country, and bring her people under the operation of just and equal laws. In connection with this opinion, we may briefly refer to the subject of his pension, upon which some obscurity still rests. About the time when he left Ireland to live permanently in London, he was offered by the Government a pension (fixed ultimately at £200 a year) ostensibly as a recognition of his services to the cause of law and order. It seems probable that the condition of his residence out of Ireland was attached to its enjoyment, as well as the condition of his ceasing to write on public questions. It was therefore neither more nor less than an official "muzzle." It was paid for a few years, and then the payment suddenly ceased; possibly because he declined to earn it by writing up the Government measures. Again, just before his death, the Government becoming aware that he was not hostile to the Union, were prevailed upon to renew the pension and pay up its arrears. With this amount O'Leary bought an annuity, but he died before the first quarter became due. Whatever the conditions of the original grant, or of its renewal, it troubled him in his latter days, and he was heard to lament "that he had betrayed his country." The only conceivable reason for this remorse was the refusal of the Government to emancipate the Catholics of Ireland—a measure which they had held out as a bait to induce their leaders to accept the Union.

About the end of 1801, O'Leary was ordered to the South of France for the benefit of his health. He crossed the Channel and proceeded a short distance through the country, but the change from the France he had known in other days so shocked and distressed him that he could go no further. The vessel in which he made his homeward voyage was unable, through stress of weather, to reach Dover, and was driven to Ramsgate. With sufferings much aggravated by sea-sickness, he had barely strength to travel to London; and he died, almost suddenly, but after having received extreme unction, on the 8th of January, 1802. He is buried in the churchyard of Old S. Pancras, where his tomb has been barely spared by the Midland Railway Company, not having the fear of Shakspeare's curse before their

eyes. The tomb was erected by his friend, Lord Moira, and is disfigured by an inelegant and ungrammatical inscription.

We fear Mr. Buckley will have been a little spoilt by the favourable, not to say flattering, notices of his work which have appeared in several critical journals of high authority. Even the sour *Saturday Review* smiles upon him ; is enchanted with his liberality ; thinks Father O'Leary "happy in his biographer" ; and bears very lightly upon some minor blemishes, which it charitably puts down to "carelessness." *We* should not have escaped its keen animadversion had we written—"The calumnies against Catholicity which he refuted are needed to-day in the eternal interests of truth." But we entertain still more serious apprehensions as to the consequences which the circulation of this work, likely to be wide, may have, in diffusing errors with which the minds of many Catholics in these islands are still tainted. We cannot forget that, upon some important public occasions, some distinguished "Athenians" have given expression in Cork to sentiments of opposition to the authority of Rome, out of harmony (we are glad to think) with the prevailing belief of English and Irish Catholics, but which had their sanction, if not their source, in such writings as those which Mr. Buckley has republished. As an editor, we regret that his judgment has not taught him better *reprobare malum et eligere bonum*. He has been warned by "good theological critics" that he was venturing on dangerous ground. He guards himself by a general disclaimer from the suspicion of sharing in Father O'Leary's "inaccuracies." Nevertheless, the *Saturday Review* has only too much reason when it says that "it is pretty clear that his own sympathies go heartily with those of O'Leary." The *Saturday Review* thinks it "a healthy sign that the life and writings of such a man should be just now put forward as a model by an Irish Roman Catholic priest." We have no fault to find with O'Leary's life. With his writings, the case is otherwise ; and it would be a sad thing if any Catholic should consider them, in point of doctrine, "a model." Mr. Buckley affirms that "no passage of his writings, as such, has ever been condemned by ecclesiastical authority." This is a mere evasion. If several propositions advanced by him have not been condemned *as his*, they have been condemned as some one else's. But we cannot take Mr. Buckley as a safe guide upon these points. He gives us a passage from O'Leary's letters to Wesley, in which, Mr. Buckley says, "the limits of the Pope's power are justly defined." Here is the just definition :—

"Catholic subjects know that, if God must have his own, Cæsar must have his due. In his quality of Pontiff, they are ready to kiss the Pope's feet ; but if he assumes the title of conqueror, they are ready to bind his hands. The very ecclesiastical benefices, which are more in the spiritual line, are not at his disposal. When England had more to dread from him than now, a Catholic parliament passed the statute of *præmunire* : the bishops and mitred abbots preferred their own temporal interest to that of the Pope, and reserved the benefices to themselves and the clergy under their jurisdiction. Charity begins at home ; and I do not believe any Catholic so divested of it as to prefer fifty pounds a year under the Pope's government to a hundred pounds a year under that of a Protestant king. Queen Mary, so devoted to the Pope's cause, both on account of her religion and the justice done to her mother, still would not concede her temporal rights, nor those of her subjects,

in compliment to his spiritual power. After the reconciliation of her kingdom to the Apostolic See, a statute was passed enacting that the Pope's bulls, briefs, &c., should be merely confined to spirituals, without interfering with the independence of her kingdom or the rights of her subjects. The history of Europe proclaims aloud that the Roman Catholics are not passive engines in the hands of Popes, and that they confine his power within the narrow limits of his spiritual province. They have often taken his cities, and opposed Paul's sword to Peter's keys, and silenced the thunders of the Vatican with the noise of the cannon. They knew that Peter was a fisherman when kings swayed the sceptre, and that the subsequent grandeur of his successors could never authorize them to alter the primitive institution that commands subjects to obey their rulers and give Cæsar his due" (pp. 127, 128).

*Ohe, jam satis est !* If this book should reach a second edition, it would be a delicate and proper attention, we think, on Mr. Buckley's part, to dedicate it to King Victor Emmanuel.

---

*The Life of Marie Eustelle-Harpain, the Sempstress of Saint-Palais, called the "Angel of the Eucharist."* London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

OUR January number of the year 1864 contains (pp. 30-2) a notice of the book, from which Mr. Thompson has compiled the second volume of his very valuable *Library of Religious Biography*.

The life of Marie-Eustelle Harpain possesses a special value and interest, apart from its extraordinary natural and supernatural beauty, from the fact that to her example and to the effect of her writings is attributed in great measure the wonderful revival of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in France, and consequently throughout Western Christendom. A marvellous effect to be produced by a village girl, whose short life of eight-and-twenty years was divided between labour for her daily bread, deeds of active charity to her neighbour, and lonely watchings before the Tabernacle ; where she realized so intensely the Presence of her Beloved, that at times she hardly seemed to long for the sight of His unveiled face in heaven.

The instrument had been fitted by the Master's hand for the work which it was to perform. Hers, says the author of the life before us, "was a simple, uneventful life ; but a life that is sublime in its very simplicity : a life with one dominant, one all-absorbing passion—the love and worship of our Incarnate God in His most Holy and most Divine Sacrament."

"Marie-Eustelle loved much and prayed much : this is sufficient to make a Saint.

"When such a one is laid in the ground, be it in the obscurest nook of earth, then it is that the life which is now ended, and which, it would seem, has but to undergo the lot of other humble lives—to be forgotten—begins to act upon the world. Many Saints have worked wonderful effects during their mortal lives, yet all, perhaps, have accomplished more after their departure to glory. So, in their measure, may it be with all God's favoured children : in more than one sense, 'their works follow them.' Of Eustelle may this be said with peculiar truth. While on earth she was ever mingling lamentations of her own powerlessness to do aught for the glory of her Lord



with the rapturous expressions of her love ; but the imperishable words in which she breathed it forth were afterwards to fly like winged seeds over the globe, and produce an abundant harvest, of which, it may be, only the first fruits have yet been garnered. 'When God would move the world,' says Eustelle's biographer, in whose steps we have humbly followed, and with whose words we cannot do better than conclude, 'He rests his lever here below upon the Saints. Under whatever form this character may appear—whether it be clothed in rags like Benedict Labré, or girt with the sword, like Auguste Marceau, whether it exercise the sacred ministry like Muard or Vianney, or ply the needle like Marie-Eustelle Harpain, a Saint is the continuation of Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ is ever a Saviour, whether in the Tabernacle where He hides Himself, or in heaven where He reigns.' ”

Mr. Thompson has adopted a plan which is, we think, excellent, of giving the substance of foreign books instead of mere translations of them. Lives thus written will be generally far freer and more life-like, and consequently more attractive, than translations. If we have any objection to make to the style of the two already published, it would be that the narrative is perhaps too flowery. The history of saints and saintly persons can hardly be too simply written.

---

*The Life and Administration of Robert Banks, second Earl of Liverpool, K.G., late First Lord of the Treasury.* Compiled from original documents. By CHARLES DUKE YONGE, Regius Professor of History and English Literature in the Queen's College, Belfast, and author of "The History of the British Navy," "The History of France under the Bourbons," &c. &c. London : Macmillan & Co.

IT is our purpose, when the forthcoming volume of the "Wellington Correspondence" shall be published, to devote an article to the consideration of Mr. Yonge's book, taken in connection with the Duke's "Correspondence," which will be of the utmost value, as enabling us to form a correct judgment of the history of the Catholic question as it affected the various Cabinets of George IV.

Mr. Yonge rates Lord Liverpool very highly indeed, perhaps too highly. as a statesman, for he seeks to place him on a level with the Pitts ; but he places beyond dispute the fact that Lord Liverpool was a really great man, High genius he had not ; but he certainly possessed that which comes not only next, but very near it—the faculty of succeeding without it. He maintained his post of Prime Minister for an almost unprecedented period, in times of great difficulty, and somehow or other he contrived to carry England with success through a great, dangerous, and difficult war. He had a troublesome Cabinet to deal with ; the mere array of names, which includes Wellington, Eldon, Huskisson, Canning, Castlereagh, and Peel, is formidable ; and he managed it as he managed the war—somehow. Added to these achievements, the guidance and control of such a man as George IV., first as regent and then as king, and the conduct of the scandalous episode of the unfortunate Caroline of Brunswick's brief

and disastrous connection with England—out of which he also got without individual disgrace,—it must be admitted that Lord Liverpool's political biographer has some solid material for the construction of his temple of fame.

Much of the correspondence contained in these volumes is curious and interesting, and that portion which relates to the course pursued towards the unhappy Princess of Wales is peculiarly so. Her royal highness's own letters form a strange contrast, both in style and spelling, to the formal documents prepared on her behalf. And the persistence with which Lord Liverpool endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, to induce the king to behave with decency when all difficulties were solved by Caroline's death, is proved, to his credit, by the memoranda given in these pages. The correspondence on this lamentable subject, on the slave-trade, and Lord Liverpool's long-sighted views concerning Holland and Belgium, form large items of the collateral interest in Mr. Yonge's useful and important work.

---

*The Kiss of Peace ; or, England and Rome] at one on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist.* An Essay in two parts ; together with a sequel or answer to criticisms on the same. By GERARD FRANCIS COBB, M.A. London : Hayes.

**T**HIS is a book that might make a strong man cry till his heart broke. How came it to be written and then published is simply a mystery, for the author has knowledge that is hardly ever possessed by any person outside the Church, and he writes in a spirit that attracts, and at the same time perplexes, all who are in the possession of that which he cannot possibly have, remaining where he is. Mr. Cobb has studied, and with the most marvellous success, the Catholic doctrine ; not as a controversialist, but in a tender and earnest spirit, anxious to learn, and more anxious, we think, to practise what he might learn. If he is to be considered a controversialist, his controversy is with his own friends, for he disputes not with Rome but with England. With him it is apparently a first principle that Rome is right and England wrong, whenever it differs—and it almost always does differ—from Rome.

This said, there is another view to be taken of the book, and a very distressing one it is. Mr. Cobb, with a full knowledge of the great importance of the doctrine he discusses, is dwelling in a community where this doctrine is scouted, and among people who ridicule and deny it. He is compelled to call men his brethren who utterly disbelieve what he holds, and who hold themselves what he knows to be most grievous heresies. More than all this, he admits that the Anglican community, to which he unhappily belongs, not only tolerates those who contradict him, but also teaches so imperfectly—if it teaches at all—what he holds, that long and elaborate expositions are necessary to bring his views into apparent harmony with the notorious definitions he acknowledges as binding on him.

Mr. Cobb has undertaken to prove that on the doctrine of the most holy Eucharist, Rome and the Anglican sect are at one ! That there is no difference between them, that there never was any, and that the popular notion on the subject is a popular delusion !

Of course a proposition of this sort takes people by surprise, but that need not be a difficulty. The fact is plain enough ; Mr. Cobb seriously and earnestly, and with all his might, contends for the admission of the doctrine of Transubstantiation among the received opinions of Anglicans. All he admits against himself is that the doctrine is not clearly taught, that is his one difficulty ; this being allowed him, he maintains that the reformers of his religion never consciously rejected the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist, or if they did so, it was by mistake, because they did not clearly understand what it was, but they did not reject it. He has persuaded himself that what the reformers meant to deny when they said that "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances" was a change in the accidents. He insists on it that they confounded "substance" with "accidents," and that, therefore, the change of substance is not denied. The conclusion is that when the reformers used the word "Transubstantiation," they really meant "transaccidentation." Here are his words :—

"Now as one of my objects in this second part is to show that by the word 'Transubstantiation,' the English Church really means 'transaccidental tion,' I must first explain what is meant by the word 'accidents' and what by the word 'substance'" (p. 56).

The explanation of the two words is correct enough, and so we need not pursue that subject further. We have then to deal with a statement which Mr. Cobb, we believe, is the first to make, and to him is due the whole credit of it. It may also be admitted that if his postulate be allowed him, he has proved his case, so far as he understands the doctrine ; but we are not quite sure that he has really mastered the Roman doctrine on the Eucharist, though he has approached nearer to it than any other person within our knowledge in the communion to which he unhappily belongs.

Before going further, we may as well show that there are grounds for suspicion that Mr. Cobb has not clearly seen what the doctrine of the Church is.

He thus quotes the Council of Trent :—

"It has ever been believed by God's Church that directly after consecration the true Body of our Lord and His true Blood are present together with the Soul and Divinity under the form of bread and wine."

We need not quote further ; but the commentary on this which Mr. Cobb makes is one of the most startling possible in his mouth, who professes to hold the doctrine of the Council. It is almost beyond belief. Here are his words :—

"Now have we, I ask, in the whole range of our Liturgy, Articles, and Catechism any more emphatic declaration of a wholly supernatural, transcendental, celestial Presence, or *any more emphatic disclaimer of a natural, sensible, corporeal Presence than this ?*" (p. 107).

The italics are ours, not Mr. Cobb's.

The word sensible is a mistake, we suppose ; but when Mr. Cobb calls upon his readers to admit that the Council of Trent disclaimed the Corporeal Presence when it teaches that the Body of Christ is present under the form

of Bread, he takes us, in one sense, by surprise. But the explanation, however, is not far to seek. It is a confusion of the fact with the mode, and that once effected, the mistake was natural enough.

We now proceed to consider the method used by Mr. Cobb to harmonize heresy with the Faith. The first assumption is that the word Transubstantiation is used in the Anglican religion in a different sense from that which the word usually bears. The second is that the Catechism is the ultimate test and the key to the meaning of the Articles and other documents in force among Anglicans. In the Catechism, which is much later than the other documents, are these words : we prefer to deal with the second method first.

“The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.”

Mr. Cobb insists on taking the words “verily and indeed taken and received” as a proof that the doctrine of the Real Presence is maintained and as explanatory of other phrases which even he admits to be at least ambiguous. But the words most assuredly cannot cover all he wants them to cover. The previous question in the Catechism is this :—

“What is the outward part or sign of the Lord’s supper ?

“*Answer.* Bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.”

Then comes the question : “What is the inward part or *thing signified* ?” To which the answer is, “The Body and Blood,” as we have just given it.

Now it is perfectly plain here that the bread and wine spoken of are bread and wine after the so-called consecration of the Anglican minister, for they are not part of the Sacrament at all till the Sacrament is wrought. Yet after that operation they are only bread and wine, whereas no Catholic would speak of bread and wine after the consecration of the priest. To remove all doubt and ambiguity, the author of the Catechism goes on and says, “Which the Lord hath commanded to be received,” it being perfectly certain that our Lord never commanded us to receive bread and wine.

This is not all. The next question is :—

“What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby ?

“*Answer.* The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine.”

Bread and wine again. Mr. Cobb, we are sure, would not have written such an answer as this, and we very much doubt whether, on further reflection, he will say that the author of the Catechism or any one that teaches or learns it, understands only the accidents of taste, colour, and smell by the words “bread and wine.” And yet that is the interpretation which his theory compels him to put upon these unambiguous words. The Catechism says nothing that Cranmer, who denies the Real Presence, did not say ; in fact, Cranmer and the Catechism speak alike, for these are the words of the former :—“As the bread is outwardly eaten indeed in the Lord’s Supper, so is the very body of Christ inwardly by faith eaten ; indeed, of all them that come thereto in such sort as they ought to do, which eating nourisheth them

unto everlasting life.”—(Cranmer’s Works, Parker Society, i. p. 17.) Again. “He is effectually present, and effectually worketh, not in the bread and wine, but in the godly receivers of them, to whom He giveth His own flesh spiritually to feed upon, and His own blood to quench their great inward thirst” (*Ibid.*, p. 35).

Anglicans say their Sacraments consist of two parts, the outward sign and the thing signified, not the thing contained.

The words, “verily and indeed taken and received,” applied to the Body and Blood, are to be regarded, according to Mr. Cobb, as explaining all ambiguous expressions, and filling up all that are defective and inexact ; but there is nothing to hinder any one from combining them with the statement in the Articles thus:—“verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper . . . . only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.” The Articles and the Catechism are perfectly consistent one with another, and there is no necessity for any explanation. The whole statement of the Articles is as follows:—

“The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.”

Nothing can be plainer. The “faithful” of the Catechism, according to the phraseology of the Article, are those who have “faith” ; for as faith is the means whereby the reception takes place, it is obvious that without faith there is no reception. Mr. Cobb will have the word faithful to mean “fideles” in the Catholic sense, and labours to show that in the Anglican rite there is a change wrought in the creatures of bread and wine by the ministers of that rite, and that the change is permanent, and not transient, to subserve a certain purpose. It is necessary for him to hold this, for it was felt by the more consistent Reformers and their successors that the act of kneeling at an Anglican Communion was something that might have been better undone, and therefore in what he calls the “black rubric,” lest the act should be “misconstrued and depraved, it is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored—for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians—and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here, it being against the truth of Christ’s natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.”

The meaning of this declaration according to Mr. Cobb is not the obvious meaning which it has always had. These are his words:—

“Now, what I want to prove is that in the one case the words, ‘very natural substances’ really mean ‘very natural properties,’ i.e., ‘accidents’” (p. 115.)

It is to this. An Anglican minister consecrates his Eucharist, or the bread and of the wine is changed while the accidents

remain ; that is, only the “very natural properties” remain : but how is it that the words bread and wine are retained, when, on the supposition of a change, there is no bread left ? Mr. Cobb believes in the real presence of our Lord under the species ; but, how can he refrain from adoration ? How can he say that the adoration would be idolatry ? If the substance of the bread and wine be changed, and nothing remain but the “natural properties,” and, if he believes that our Lord is there, why does he not confess his Presence by the outward and natural act of adoration ?

If it be replied that adoration is refused to the “bread and wine,” that is to the “accidents,” which remain, nothing further need be said ; and we must be content with observing that nobody ever thought of adoring the accidents. But the words “Sacramental bread and wine,” must mean the bread and wine after the consecration,—supposing a consecration to have taken place ;—for they are not sacramental before that act is complete, and the whole phrase puts this beyond all doubt, seeing that the words are “Sacramental bread and wine there bodily received,” that is, to use the Catholic language, the consecrated Host. Now the “black rubric,” says that no adoration “ought to be done” either to the Host, “or unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural Flesh and Blood.” The reason given for this refusal to worship is that the “bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances,” and that “the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven and not here.”

All is plain enough, for a Sacrament is only a sign, according to the Anglicans—“an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us,”—consisting of two parts, “the outward visible sign and the inward spiritual grace.” \* Now, if Mr. Cobb can show that by the word “inward,” is meant “in the sacrament,” and not exclusively in the receiver of the sacrament, he will be able to maintain in some degree the conclusions he has arrived at ; but we do not believe he can, and we are persuaded that he will find very few to agree with him. Of another Catechism, but which in this matter agrees with the Catechism which Mr. Cobb relies on, Cranmer says to the Bishop of Winchester :—

“In that Catechism I teach not, as you do, that the Body and Blood of Christ is contained in the Sacrament being reserved, but that in the ministration thereof we receive the Body and Blood of Christ : whereunto if it may please you to add or understand this word ‘spiritually,’ then is the doctrine of my Catechism sound and good in all men’s ears, which know the true doctrine of the Sacraments” (Parker Society Ed., p. 227).

This is the Anglican doctrine most assuredly. The Sacrament is a sign, containing nothing ; it is a means and a help, but it is nothing more. The definition of a sacrament or description of it, as a sign and a thing signified, not a thing contained, is clearly fatal to Mr. Cobb’s opinion ; and the writers of the articles, assuming the old Anglican definition to be correct, say that transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament ; that is, the sacra-

---

\* How many parts are there in a Sacrament ? *Ans.* Two : the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace.



ment, because our Lord is present himself, does more than signify, it contains.

The Anglican doctrine admits of the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament, but not as we Catholics understand the words "presence" and "sacrament." The Reformers mean by the Sacrament the ministration of it, the whole action, not the Host ; and in the Sacrament so understood they admit a presence of our Lord, but they deny that He is present in the hands of the priest before the reception of the Host by the communicant : further still, they mean by presence not what we do ; and the controversy is usually without profit, because the words are used in different senses.

Cranmer's views are, of course, scouted by Mr. Cobb ; but Cranmer knew his own mind, and the meaning of the words he used when he set up the Anglican rite. His opinions are perfectly consistent with the articles and other writings of authority in the Anglican community, and none other can be harmonized with them. Here are more of his words :—

"The bread is a figure and sacrament of Christ's body. And yet as He giveth the bread to be eaten with our mouths, so giveth He His very Body to be eaten with our faith. And therefore, I say, that Christ giveth Himself truly to be eaten, chewed, and digested ; but all is spiritually with faith, not with mouth." (*Ibid.*, p. 15).

"In the true ministration of the Sacrament Christ is present spiritually, and so spiritually eaten of them that be godly and spiritual" (*Ibid.*, p. 203). That is, by "the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Mr. Cobb in defending his notion has to maintain—we now return to his first assumption—that the true doctrine of the Catholic Church was either not known or known imperfectly in England for a century before the rise of Cranmer. That apostate, therefore, in denying the doctrine of the Eucharist was not denying the true doctrine, but the imperfect and inaccurate views of it current in the country ? As this notion concerning Cranmer is, we believe, new and is most certainly altogether unfounded, we shall let Mr. Cobb speak for it himself :—

"Cranmer, although using technical language, and often employing it too in quasi scientific arguments, really knew nothing of the meaning of that language, as defined by the schoolmen" (p. 206).

"That Presence [the Real Presence] never presented Itself to his mind in Its true sense, as authoritatively taught ; neither when put before him by another did he shew himself in the least degree *en rapport* with the language and ideas on which it is dogmatically based and constructed. And we cannot, therefore, wonder at his protesting against that which he *thought* was the Roman doctrine of the Real Presence. . . . Cranmer did *not consciously reject* the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, though he certainly did not accept it" (pp. 210, 211).

"Though I am not prepared, therefore, to say that the Reformers accepted Roman doctrine, I am fully persuaded that it was not *that* which they rejected" (Note, p. 212).

"The *possibility* of our 'Real Objective Presence,' and of the Latin '*transubstantiatio*,' never seem to have consciously presented itself to him at all, and so he cannot be said to have rejected *that*" (Note, p. 385).

In these extracts the words printed in italics are so printed by Mr. Cobb,

and we have carefully abstained from giving greater prominence to his words than he has given to them himself. But he has a difficulty to remove before we can even take so singular a notion into account at all. What is this? Cranmer was educated as a Catholic, and was known to be a learned man, though with heretical views, when he was discovered by Henry VIII. He had lived many years at Cambridge, though not blameless in his life; he must have known the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, and he also must have said Mass. He had sat under learned professors, had learned philosophy, and must have mastered the terms of it, for he must have disputed in the schools before he took his several degrees. Could such a man, heretic though he was for many years, before the schism, be ignorant of the doctrine which he once held, but which he was gradually giving up? Mr. Cobb thinks he could not have used the arguments he did, if he ever knew the doctrine he was combating; but the answer is ready, that men are not scrupulous about their arguments if a popular or erroneous one will answer their immediate purpose, and it was easier for Cranmer, as it was for Wicliffe before him, to employ ribaldry rather than serious reasons, for both of them felt that serious reasoning was out of the question. The wretched apostate himself confesses in plain terms that he knew what he was saying and doing:—

“I acknowledge that not many years passed, I was yet in darkness concerning this matter, being brought up in scholastic and Romish doctrine, whereunto I gave too much credit” (Works, p. 241).

Now, did Cranmer know the Roman doctrine? Mr. Cobb says he did not; and we are compelled to say that Cranmer spoke as if he did know it. He wrote a book on the subject, and he wrote it too in English, and was thereby obliged to translate the scholastic terminology and employ English words as the equivalents of the Latin. Here are his words in his reply to the Bishop of Winchester:—

“First, the Papists say that in the Supper of the Lord, after the words of consecration—as they call it—there is none other substance remaining but the substance of Christ’s flesh and blood, so that there remaineth neither bread to be eaten nor wine to be drunken. And although there be the colour of bread and wine, the savour, the smell, the bigness, the fashion and all other—as they call them—accidents, or qualities and quantities of bread and wine, yet, say they, there is no very bread nor wine, but they be turned into the flesh and blood of Christ. And this conversion they call ‘Transubstantiation,’ that is to say, ‘turning of one substance into another’” (Works of Cranmer, i. p. 45).

We do not think it possible for any one to doubt for a moment that Cranmer had a clear knowledge of the Catholic doctrine; the man was a deliberate heretic, he knew the truth and rejected it. He did not confound “substance” with “accident,” for he goes on, and speaking of the accidents he uses these words:—

“There is sweetness without anything sweet; softness without any soft thing; breaking, without anything broken; division, without anything divided; and so other qualities and quantities, without anything to receive

them. And this doctrine they teach as a necessary article of our faith. But it is not the doctrine of Christ, but the subtle invention of anti-Christ" (*Ibid.*).

We appeal to Mr. Cobb himself. Can he maintain seriously that Cranmer meant Transaccidentation when he used the word Transubstantiation? It is perfectly incredible that the Reformers who gave up their breviaries and their missals did not know what they were doing, or that they used the well-known words of the Church in a sense in which the Church had never used them.

Mr. Cobb says that the "possibility" of the "Latin 'transubstantiatio' never seems to have "consciously presented itself" to Cranmer; but we find Cranmer writing on the subject in these terms:—

"As for the great power and omnipotency of God, it is no place here to dispute what God can do, but what He doth. I know that He can do what He will, both in heaven and in earth, and no man is able to resist His will. But the question here is of His will, not of His power" (Cranmer's Works, i. p. 15).

Cranmer certainly knew the doctrine of the Church, rejected it deliberately, and devised expressions whereby heresy might be taught, and the truth effectually suppressed. He knew how near he could approach the truth without reaching it, and was aware of the whole terminology in which the Catholic doctrine was clothed. He admitted that our Lord was "spiritually present," and then denied that he was "after a spiritual manner present" (*Ibid.*, p. 123).

The conclusion to which we come, and we do not think Mr. Cobb can be surprised at it, is this: Cranmer knew what Transubstantiation means as well as anybody else, and was also perfectly aware of the meaning of Transaccidentation. Here are his words:—

"For seeing that this place speaketh of consecrated bread, answer me to this whether the substance or accidents be consecrated! And if you say the accidents, then, forasmuch as consecration by your doctrine is conversion, it must follow that the accidents of bread be converted, and not the substance; and so should you call it Transaccidentation and not Transubstantiation" (*Ibid.*, p. 327).

Mr. Cobb has left one part of the question untouched. He maintains a "Real Objective Presence," but he has not produced a single syllable from the formulæ of his community which can be explained as meaning that our Lord is present under the species. He has found nothing, and nothing can be found, that goes beyond the Zuinglian notion which Cranmer has most correctly summed up as the whole teaching of Anglicanism, in the following words:—

"And yet in the Lord's Supper rightly used, is Christ's body exhibited indeed spiritually, and so really, if you take really to signify only a spiritual and not a corporal and carnal exhibition. But this real and spiritual exhibition is to the receivers of the Sacrament, and not to the bread and wine" (*Ibid.*, p. 123).

Mr. Cobb has written a very ingenious book, and we are very sorry that he should be entangled in the snares of heresy. He shows a better spirit than is done by many a controversialist, and we commend him earnestly to the prayers of our readers ; for why should he be lost who has come so near to the mouth of the harbour ? He has not set himself down to criticise the Church, he finds no fault with the faultless one, and against his own friends he defends the daily and common teaching of the Church, and refuses to accept the too prevalent notion current among his co-religionists that the popular teaching of the priesthood varies from the recorded definitions of doctrine.

---

*Some Remarks upon the Dean of Westminster's "Characteristics of the Papacy."* By Rev. ALEXIUS MILLS. London : Lane, 310, Strand.

**H**ARDLY any writer is so provoking to a Catholic as Dean Stanley. He regards Catholicity with profound aversion in all its aspects, theological, social, political. If he ever praises any Catholics at all, it is exclusively those who are prominent among their co-religionists in disloyalty to the Holy See ; and these the Dean praises on that very account, for their "candour," "independence," "dispassionateness." Yet this bitter and prejudiced anti-Catholic partisan assumes the airs of philosophical impartiality ; he is not, forsooth, as Mr. Whalley or the *Record* ; he is raised above the stormy atmosphere of controversy.

We think therefore that Mr. Mills's indignant tone is thoroughly well deserved by its object, though we may perhaps doubt its expediency. We are not acquainted with the two papers of Dean Stanley which he criticises, and most certainly we shall not go out of our way to get a sight of them ; but judging from an *ex parte* statement, Mr. Mills's refutation seems completely crushing. We will mention two instances which amusingly illustrate two of the Dean's peculiarities : viz., (1) the great carelessness with which he accepts anti-Catholic facts, and (2) the fantastic inferences which he draws from facts which are undoubted. Thus (1) he states (Mills, p. 23) that the Holy Father receives communion in a sitting posture ; the purest romance. And (2) the well-known usage, that the Papal choir sings without organ accompaniment, is ludicrously wrought up by the Dean (Mills, p. 33) as an indication of the Pope being "*on this point a Presbyterian*." "For," quoth the Dean, "at Glasgow the organ would be regarded as a blast from the Seven Hills." Presbyterians think that the organ is specially characteristic of Rome ; and the Pontiff shows his agreement with them on this head, by *excluding* the organ from the highest ecclesiastical functions in Rome !

We have read with great interest Mr. Mills's expositions of Catholic doctrine (pp. 13, 14) on certain "questions which Catholics discuss among themselves, and which have been so singularly misunderstood by the Dean ;" though what the Dean's special misunderstandings are, we know not. Mr. Mills expresses his firm conviction that the Pope is infallible when speaking *ex cathedrâ* : and that he often speaks *ex cathedrâ*, not only within the

strict sphere of theology, but on matters also of "philosophy, political economy, physical science, art, history, and literature," which have a real bearing on religious truth and the welfare of souls. We are firmly convinced that any Catholic, who in these days occupies himself actively with intellectual speculation, and who does not most unreservedly submit his judgment to the Church's on all such questions, incurs a real danger of apostacy.

---

*Keighly Hall, and other Tales.* By E. KING. London : R. Washbourne.

**K**EIGHLEY HALL is a book of unpretending little tales, apparently intended for children ; who, being most merciful critics, will appreciate the interesting incidents in the stories, without perceiving their defects. These tales are written in a most zealously Catholic strain ; but, as in too many Catholic books of the kind, the very zeal of their author prompts a continual display, or rather boast, of our holy religion, which would be injudicious if intended for any but juvenile readers. Many of the lower classes indeed, whose minds from want of education greatly resemble those of children in several respects, may derive not only amusement, but profit and instruction from the very faults of which we complain ; for the continual trumpeting of the Catholic Faith which chiefly distinguishes these stories will tend to give them an exalted idea of their religion. But looking at the book with a critical eye, we cannot see why, in the first tale, the little heroine, a child of eleven years, is to be ignorant of the name of Jesus because she is a Protestant ; nor do we think the wholesale conversions with which the story ends either natural or likely. But the whole plot of this tale is so ludicrously improbable, that perhaps it is absurd to point out any special circumstance as being strange. The same spirit pervades the rest of the book. Protestants are only brought in for almost instantaneous conversion ; and Catholic doctrines are no sooner explained, than they carry conviction within a wondrously short space of time to all whom the writer will recognize as other than knaves or fools.

Let us trust that, as the Catholic religion spreads, its tenets may be taken more for granted in English Catholic books ; that while the sincerely religious spirit which animates the volume before us may ever pervade their contents, the various particulars of Catholicism may be made less affectedly prominent ; and that greater attempts may be made to appreciate fairly non-Catholic religionists.

---

*The Church's Creed or the Crown's Creed?* By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. London : Hayes.

**I**N April, 1865 (p. 558), we gave some extracts from a work of Mr. Ffoulkes's which, in their obvious sense, affirmed (1) that the Papal supremacy was not instituted by God, but on the contrary is at variance with His highest designs ; and (2) that the visible Church is not

now corporately united. In our next number we inserted a letter from him (pp. 140–142), disavowing the latter heresy, but leaving the former untouched. He now however unquestionably holds, what he then disavowed. “There are Churches,” he says (p. 43), “forming part of the Catholic Church, which are, and have been for ages, out of communion with” the Holy “See”: nay, with the blundering and ignorant recklessness which is his characteristic, he declares that this has long been “the formal teaching of the Popes.” He further adds (p. 2), that the Church in communion with Rome is not to his mind certainly infallible in any sense whatever.\* All these are not merely *heresies*, i.e., contradictory to what the Church teaches as integral portions of the Faith; but they are *fundamental* heresies, i.e., they subvert the very ecclesiastical *foundation* of the faith. Mr. Ffoulkes adds (p. 66), that the Church has no power of imposing on the laity any definitions of faith beyond the Nicene Creed. And for his own part indeed, he professes one particular heresy, viz., that the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Son; for the definition of certain Ecumenical Councils “makes” him “deny by implication all that the clause” “Filioque” “asserts” (p. 19).

It is important to point out all this distinctly; because this pamphlet, while intrinsically worthless, derives a certain extrinsic influence over the mind of Tractarians, from the circumstance that they regard it as written by a “Roman Catholic.” Mr. Ffoulkes is just as much and just as little a “Roman Catholic” in creed, as Dr. Pusey or Mr. Liddon.

We did not receive the pamphlet till within a week of Christmas; and it is impossible therefore to attempt any complete criticism of it in our present number. But we will make some remarks on its main arguments.

Mr. Ffoulkes maintains then, that the Church had no power—he does not merely say of adding “Filioque” to the Symbol—but even of declaring the dogma thereby expressed to be *de fide*. For this he gives two reasons: one as old as the hills, the other invented by himself. The former of these is based on the well-known seventh canon of Ephesus, which forbids persons from bringing forward any *πίστις ἑτέρα παρὰ τὴν ορισθεῖσαν* at Nicæa, and from proposing such a *πίστις* to converts from any misbelief or heresy. Various arguments have for many centuries been drawn from this canon by anti-Roman controversialists. The most extravagant of all, which Mr. Ffoulkes has embraced to its full extent alleges that the supreme authority of the Church was itself estopped by this decree, from ever putting forth any further definition of faith whatever on any imaginable subject. Let us look at this allegation.

Now firstly there is the obvious fact, to which F. Perrone and others have drawn attention, that this canon refers to the Nicene Creed strictly so called, and without its Constantinopolitan additions. Mr. Ffoulkes distinctly admits this (p. 13), on the very irrefragable ground that the

---

\* “I was never required to profess” belief in her infallibility “on entering her communion, and perhaps might never have entered it if I had been.”



larger; Creed had not been spoken of in that Council at all. It follows therefore that, according to Mr. Ffoulkes, the Ephesine canon prohibited every bishop (for bishops are mentioned in it expressly) from proposing to any convert the Constantinopolitan (*i.e.*, what is now called the Nicene) Creed. Now it is the Constantinopolitan Creed, and not the original Nicene, which declares that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. According to Mr. Ffoulkes therefore, during the interval between Ephesus and Chalcedon, it was not only unlawful to teach converts as *de fide* that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, but equally unlawful to teach them as *de fide* the Constantinopolitan definition that He proceeds from the Father.

It is absolutely certain therefore, that Mr. Ffoulkes has entirely misapprehended the meaning of the Ephesine canon, and that his argument resting on that canon falls to the ground.\*

But his ridiculous absurdities by no means end here. He proceeds to argue (p. 13) that this canon, though only disciplinary as enacted at Ephesus, became doctrinal as enacted at Chalcedon. Our readers will ask with amazement, how the very same canon, expressed substantially in the very same words, can have a disciplinary meaning in one Council and a doctrinal one in another. But nothing should amaze them from Mr. Ffoulkes. His reason is, that it stands among the Acts of Chalcedon in a different *position*, from that where it stands among the Acts of Ephesus! Consequently those very words, which at Ephesus were merely disciplinary—which merely (according to Mr. Ffoulkes) forbade any further definition of faith to be proposed till the Church should otherwise determine—constituted at Chalcedon a doctrinal decree of the most overwhelming significance. This originally disciplinary decree, we say, became (by the mere change of its location) an irreformable and infallible doctrinal declaration, imposed on the belief of all Catholics: a declaration, that under no future circumstances while the world lasted could a new definition of faith be possibly expedient. Evidently, in comparison with such a momentous declaration as this, the mere condemnation of Eutyches would sink into nothing; the one event of Chalcedon, overshadowing all others, would be the infallible declaration, that no further definitions of faith could be lawfully issued. Yet so little was the Church conscious of having put forth this unparalleled announcement, that so soon as fresh heretics arose, she proceeded, as a matter of course, to condemn them by fresh definitions of faith. And to no one throughout Christendom, orthodox or heretic,† did

---

\* It is indubitable to our mind, that what the Ephesine canon forbade was the proposing any definition *at variance* with the Nicene Creed. We will give our reasons for this opinion in our next number. Meanwhile we refer to Cardinal Julian's most unanswerable argument, as recorded in the Greek Acts of Florence under the eleventh session.

† It so happens, in curious contrast with Mr. Ffoulkes's theory, that Eutyches and his friends did appeal to the Ephesine canon in arrest of judgment; whereas we believe we are correct in saying that no Monothelite, *e.g.*, is recorded as having thought of appealing to the parallel canon of Chalcedon.

the objection occur, during e.g., the whole Monothelite controversy, that the Church had abdicated at Chalcedon her right of infallibly defining at all.

We feel the ignominy of having to notice the author's childish babble. But we are told on good authority that, however just an estimate is placed by *Catholics* on Mr. Ffoulkes's ability, there are persons external to the Church whom his writings influence.

Mr. Ffoulkes's second reason for condemning the "Filioque" is peculiar to himself; and, we venture to prophesy, is likely to continue so. The Constantinopolitan Creed, says the Council of Chalcedon, "teaches forth the perfect doctrine concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The word "*ἐκδιδάσκει*," "teaches forth," our author preposterously translates, for his controversial purpose, "teaches explicitly." And then he asks, "How can *explicit* teaching, which is *perfect*, admit of any further explanation," such as the "Filioque"? (p. 19). St. Paul had declared to the Ephesian presbyters "the whole counsel of God (Acts xx. 27). Consequently, in Mr. Ffoulkes's view, no question could be asked concerning any portion of God's counsel, to which St. Paul's oral communications would not have furnished these presbyters with a complete and satisfactory answer.

Nothing can be more absurd than our author's allegation, that the Creed, if it include the "Filioque," is "the Crown's Creed," and not the "Church's." Good Catholics accept it because the *Ecclesia Docens* teaches it, and for no other reason whatever. In all the questions raised on the matter from first to last, between Rome and other churches of the West, there was no reference whatever to dogma; no doubt on any side, either that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, or that all Catholics are under a strict obligation of so believing. The points at issue were exclusively these: (1) the addition of the words "Filioque" to the Nicene Symbol, and (2) the chanting of the Symbol in any shape during Mass. The facts, in brief, are as follows:—

There was no difficulty among most of the ancient heretics, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. Those who denied the Divinity of our Lord, were ready to confess, and did confess, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son; because they regarded both as inferior to, or creations of, the Father. After the Nicene definition, the next trouble arose from those who denied that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. They were met by inserting in the Creed the words, "proceeds from the Father;" there being no necessity then of adding "and the Son," because that truth was admitted. The difficulty was, to get the heretics to admit the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

In Spain, on the death of Leogild the Arian who had so cruelly persecuted the bishops and others who persevered in the Faith, his son Reccared became king, and also a convert; indeed, his father had repented before his death. Reccared placed himself in the hands of that great confessor, S. Leander, Bishop of Seville; and applied himself to the conversion of his Gothic subjects. He was successful in his work; and then invited all the Catholic Bishops to Toledo, or summoned them, if anybody likes that

phrase better ; where he and the Queen made a public profession of the Catholic Faith, and gave up into the hands of the Council that profession signed with their names. The bishops accepted it with joy ; and then delegated one of their brethren to receive the Arian bishops, who seem to have been in waiting. The Arians were examined ; and upon renouncing their heresy and making profession of the true Faith, were received into the Church. Reccared, and the Queen, and the Gothic bishops, all professed their belief in the words we use at this day : saying of the Holy Ghost that He proceeds from the Father and the Son. If those Goths had merely said of the Holy Ghost that He proceeds from the Father, without the "Filioque," it is possible that the orthodox bishops might have suspected the sincerity of their conversion : because the omission of the "Filioque" might sound as if the Goths still denied the equality of the Son with the Father.

Now Mr. Ffoulkes says that S. Leander and the other prelates, as well as the converted Goths, did wrong in thus interpolating the Nicene creed. He does not blame the prelates perhaps so much as the king. Indeed, he cares very little about the bishops ; and accordingly we are told that the "original introduction (of the 'Filioque') was due to a king named Reccared, of a barbarous and till then heretical race, who, A.D. 589, in the act of abjuring Arianism, promulgated the Creed in question ignorantly or wilfully with this addition, at the head of the bishops of his dominions, many of them neophytes from Arianism like himself" (p. 6).

The Spanish Goths came from the East, and knew the customs of the Eastern Church ; one of which, chanting the Symbol in the Mass, they introduced into Spain. But while doing this, they had before them the decrees of the General Councils ; and particularly the decree of the Council of Chalcedon, which, according to Mr. Ffoulkes, forbids the insertion of the "Filioque" in the Creed. Well, the two Saints, Euphemius and Leander, with their brethren and even the converted Goths, could not or did not see that decree in the light in which Mr. Ffoulkes would have men see it. Mr. Ffoulkes does not contemplate it as possible, that they could have been quite right, and that he may be quite wrong.

From Spain the custom of chanting the Symbol in the Mass crept into France and Germany, and into the Royal Chapel of Charlemagne. The French and German bishops obtained leave from the Pope as to the chanting, but said nothing at first about the addition of the word "Filioque." There was no difficulty about the doctrine ; and there was therefore no hesitation about expressing what everybody believed, and what the Church had undeviatingly taught. And because of this we are told by Mr. Ffoulkes that the Creed of the Church is the Creed of the Crown !

Another fact is the persistency of Charlemagne in retaining the word in the Symbol, after its insertion was disapproved of at Rome. The history of the matter is this : Some Greeks in Jerusalem censured certain Latin monks, because the latter chanted the Symbol like King Reccared. The Latin monks immediately repaired to the Pope for his direction, and excused themselves by alleging the fact that they had

heard it so sung in the chapel of the Emperor. The Pope, knowing well the nature of the Oriental and Greek mind—so jealous as to the slightest change in ancient usage—wished to stop the evil by returning to the old form of the Symbol ; but the French bishops were wedded to their chant, and no change was made in their dioceses. Charlemagne supported them, and the Pope's wishes were not respected ; nor did the Pontiff think it wise to press the thing further.

It is not very clear when the Credo was first chanted in Rome in the Mass ; nor when it was that the "Filioque" was inserted therein. But this is certain (1) that no Catholic bishop whosoever ever thought it unlawful for the Pope to insert it ; and (2) that the controversy was never at that time understood to turn on any point of dogma whatever, but exclusively on the lawfulness and propriety of inserting the two words in the Symbol. That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, was accepted alike by Pope and bishops as indisputably a part of the Catholic Faith.

So much on Mr. Ffoulkes's main argument. We must postpone for another quarter any further elucidation of these facts ; as well as our comment on his individual statements, and on the general spirit which pervades all. Mr. Ffoulkes's intellectual self-confidence approaches to a monomania ; and is the more remarkable (perhaps however the *less* remarkable) because in intellectual power he is decidedly below the average of ordinary educated men. At the same time we are bound to do him this justice, that his works are singularly and most honourably free from all bitterness, and from all imputation of unworthy motives. We cannot indeed but feel far more kindly disposed to him, than we do to several others, who err far less seriously than he does against Catholic doctrine ; and we cherish moreover a hope, that the slenderness of his abilities may justly be held responsible in part for his various heresies. It would give us the sincerest pleasure to hear of his being converted to the Catholic Faith ; though no one feels more deeply than we do, that if one may judge from appearances, an almost miraculous intervention of grace would be required for his genuine conversion.

---

*The Lives of the principal Benedictine Writers of the Congregation of S. Maur ; with an Historical Introduction.* By CHARLES M'CARTHY. London : Burns, Oates, & Co. 1868.

THE labours of the great Maurist historians, critics, and editors are better known than their lives. Yet their lives cannot help being matters of interest to those who read their names on the title-pages of their ponderous folios. As a body, these Benedictines contribute a bright and wonderful page to a period of the history of France that can boast of very few bright pages. The congregation of S. Maur was approved by Gregory XV. in 1620, and lasted till it was overwhelmed in the wreck of the great Revolution. Its list of great men commences almost with its commencement. Dom Luke d'Achery, the compiler of the famous "Spicilegium," and the master of Mabillon, came to reside at S. Germain

des Près in 1633. The superior of the house at the time was Dom Tardieu, the director of M. Olier. As the prompter and promoter of learning and study, Dom Tardieu may claim to be a founder of S. Maur, as he may claim to be a founder of S. Sulpice. Mabillon received the habit in 1653, and died on the feast of S. John the Evangelist, 1707. Before he died, Gerberon, Garet, Constant, Martianay, Montfaucon, Ruinart, and De S. Marthe, had already given to the world volume after volume of the "Benedictine" editions of the Fathers; and after his death the work went on with undiminished vigour into the middle of the eighteenth century, one of the last great works being the famous "Origen" of the two De la Rue. Besides these treasures of patrology, the world has to thank these monks, and chiefly Mabillon and Montfaucon, for a whole library of annals, histories, and collections, in which they put beyond the reach of danger the best of the treasures of every collection in France, the Low Countries, and Italy. It is sufficient to mention the *Acta Sanctorum*, and the *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti*, *L'Antiquité expliquée*, and the *Gallia Christiana*. There was surely something providential in the appearance of such a body of workers among the dusty treasures of royal, monastic, and municipal libraries just before that deluge came which was to destroy kings, monks, and civil institutions as ruthlessly as the literary treasures they guarded.

The royal abbey of S. Denis, and the more than royal abbey of S. Germain des Prés, were the head-quarters of work in the Maurist Congregation. The libraries of the capital, including, not least, their own splendid collections, necessarily made Paris the central point. But the reformed monasteries in the provinces were not behindhand in labour, science, and piety. S. Remi, at Rheims, contributed not a few famous names; Edmond Martène there wrote his celebrated Commentary on the Rule; whilst Calmet, a better known name, wrote his "Commentary on the Scripture," amid the regular and peaceful duties of a monk at Munster, in Lorraine. In addition to all their labours in preserving the past, the Maurist monks took a vigorous share in the controversies of the day. Some of these occasional tractates are too well known to need particular mention; but during the 150 years the Congregation flourished, the writing of small angry books was the recognized way to wage a literary war; and the little books of the Maurists were quite as plentiful, and, except in the case of the really great men, perhaps quite as angry as any which issued from Paris, Lyons, or Amsterdam. Jansenism was a fruitful mother of troubles to the generations that knew the Maurists. Some of them were not as clear about Jansenism as they ought to have been; but, indirectly, they did more to kill it than any other body of men. One mainstay of Jansenism was a pretended respect for the Fathers, and one of its great weapons was to wrest them and misquote them. The new Benedictine editions of the great Fathers put a genuine text within the reach of every scholar, and their magnificent annotations educated the world in the true way of handling it. Another feature of their day was the infidelity of Spinoza and Voltaire; and it may be recalled that Dom Lami, of S. Denis, the Benedictine philoso-

pher, was one of the few who considered it worth while to refute Spinoza, whilst Calmet seems to have as nearly converted Voltaire as ever Voltaire was converted. The chief names of these great scholars are as celebrated for their piety as for their learning. The lives of Mabillon, Montfauçon, d'Achery, Martène, and Calmet, are quite models of sanctified studiousness, such as we read of in venerable Bede, in Walafrid Strabo, or in Rabanus Maurus.

Mr. M'Carthy prefaces what he has to say about these great men with a short notice of monasticism in general, of S. Benedict, of his Rule, and the history of his Order. Many readers will be struck with the collection of extracts which he has put together (pp. 53 to 65), showing the opinions of various eminent modern writers about the monks. The passages quoted from Adam Smith, Mill, and Wordsworth will probably be new to many.

The lives which he gives are those of Mabillon, Montfauçon, d'Achery, Lami, de S. Marthe, Rainurt, and Calmet. As the lives of such men are chiefly their literary works, M. M'Carthy has done well in giving his readers a very full account of all they have written. There are many incidents of strong and touching interest in these lives. The meeting of Mabillon and de Rancé, after their controversy, is one of them. So is the picture of Mabillon at Clairvaux, working at the *Annales* in his old age, and praying every day a long time at the tomb of S. Bernard for strength and life to finish them.

To the multitude of fairly read people, who know nothing accurate about S. Benedict, or the Benedictines, or the Maurists, we heartily recommend this little volume. They will find it full of interesting matter, of a kind that will make them carry out the praiseworthy aim of the author, and go to fuller sources to learn more. The present generation should know about the Maurists as well as about the court of Louis XIV.; about Mabillon, as well as about Bossuet, Calbert, and Le Tellier, his contemporaries and friends; about S. Germain des Prés, as well as about Versailles. It was only the other day that the tomb of Augustine Calmet was discovered in his own abbey church of Senones, in Lorraine. And there are yet living English Benedictines who remember an expatriated Maurist monk, Dom Leveaux, as a member of the community of S. Gregory the Great, at Downside. He is said to have known Montfauçon. At any rate, he laboured in the Paris libraries at the *Gallia Christiana* with Montfauçon's contemporaries. His learning, his zeal for monastic observance, and his personal asceticism, are well remembered to this day. He laboured from morning till night, and the fruits of his labours were apparent in huge piles of MSS. which have unfortunately not been preserved, but which have since been anxiously inquired for on behalf of the French Government. It is probable that they may have contained a fresh instalment of the *Gallia Christiana*. Dom Leveaux finished his life as a hermit, at Senlis, near Compiègne, where he lived on alms and, like a true hermit, attended the parish church on Sundays, in the capacity of subdeacon. He seems to have died about 1820.



*The Voyage and Travaille of Sir John Manndevile, Kt.*; which treateth of the way to Hierusalem; and of Marvayles of Inde, with other Llandes and Countryes. Reprinted from the edition of A.D. 1725. With an Introduction, additional Notes, and Glossary. By J. O. HALLIVELL, Esq., F.S.A., F.R.A.S. London: F. S. Ellis, King Street, Covent Garden.

THIS new and perfect edition of the extraordinary book of Sir John Manndevile, the ancestor of the literature of travel, and the most gigantic specimen of credulity, if not of mendacity, in existence, is quite an *article de luxe*. The text is taken from the Cotton Manuscript, as given in the edition of 1725, and the Introduction contains a history of the book, from its first appearance at the end of the 14th century, as a small folio, written in double columns on vellum, to its appearance in 1480, in the French language, and in folio shape, splendidly printed in double columns, but without place or name of printer. "Nothing can exceed," says the editor, "the beautiful condition of this exemplar." The present edition is published from a manuscript 300 years old, and collated with seven MSS., some nearly as old as the author's own time, and four old printed éditions. It agrees with the Latin and French MSS., and appears to be the genuine work of the author, who says that he translated it out of Latin into French, and out of French into English; whereas all other printed editions are so curtailed and transposed as to be made thereby other books. The editor claims more respect for Sir John Manndevile's strange work than it has generally received, and makes an ingenious apology for his having "drawn" so lavishly as he has been accused of doing "on his imagination for his facts." He wrote according to the ignorance of the times he lived in, took monsters from Pliny, miracles from legends, and strange stories out of romances. The falsities in his history are occasioned by other authors, at that time accounted true, and the fault of the historian that he did not name his authors. When he tells the most improbable stories, he prefaces them with "This says," or "Men say, but I have not sene it," and he owns the book is partly made up of hearsay. "The enthusiasm of a zealous Roman Catholic" is rather an amusing reason to assign for a traveller's believing such tales as that of the griffins, the golden hills, and the one-footed men, whose one foot is large enough to shelter them from the sun, considering he wrote in the 14th century, when learning was mostly in the hands of "zealous Roman Catholics" *par excellence*. The book is very curious and interesting, if only because it teaches us how our countrymen talked in those times, and shows from what chaotic confusion the art of printing reduced spelling to a system. In this book we find the same word spelled differently several times within a few pages, indeed within a few lines. The quaint style, the simple statement of the most incredible absurdities, the childlike wonder, the unconscious courage, and the true reverence and

piety which not all the author's extravagance can make grotesque, give the wonderful old book a charm to which few will be insensible; when the first difficulty of the ancient language is overcome, they find it easy to follow the meaning. As a sample of the compound structure of the English tongue it also possesses much interest.

---

*Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets.* By the Rev. EDWIN PAXTON HOOD.  
London: Jackson, Walford, & Hodder. 1867.

THE volume bearing this rather unsuggestive title contains a series of lectures on the vocation of the preacher, addressed to a College of "Students for the Ministry," founded by Mr. Spurgeon. The lectures exhibit much shrewdness and good sense, and the fruits of a large and varied reading, put together in a rather loose and rambling way. But the interest of the book for a Catholic reader lies in its treatment of Catholic Saints and men of note. The author proposes to illustrate his subject by a review of great preachers of various ages; he could not therefore avoid all mention of the Catholic Church; but he has, in fact, been far from attempting to do so. Not to speak of the chapters on the Apostolic and Early Church, accompanied by a glowing description of St. John Chrysostom, he has a lecture on "Medieval and Post-Medieval Preachers," coupled with a monograph of St. Bernard as a representative of the preachers of his age. This is followed, later on, by an admiring critique on the preaching of "Pusey, Manning, and Newman," and a sketch of the career of Father Lacordaire. The whole book, too, is interspersed with frequent references to Catholic Saints, and anecdotes from their lives. It is the fact of his acquaintance with these matters, and of the tone and spirit in which they are referred to in his lectures, which seems to us so interesting.

One of the chief grounds of hope in the minds of Catholics, five-and-twenty years ago, when they first began to be startled by the literature of the Oxford movement, must have been this, that thinkers and earnest men of the Church of England were now fairly in the presence of Catholic theology, and still more of Catholic sanctity. Would it be too much to say that the study of the lives of the Saints has been in fact the most powerful agent in the religious revolution which we have lived to witness in England? Hitherto it has seemed as if the Dissenters were quite inaccessible to the light of the Catholic Church. An impenetrable and self-satisfied ignorance has seemed to shut out hopelessly all her thought, life, and sanctity from their vision. Are we too sanguine in accepting this book as a sign of a dawning change—as a symptom that the winter is over and the ice breaking up? English dissent, it is well known, has not been without its æsthetic movement: is it now about to enter upon its doctrinal one? Let our readers judge from a few specimens whether there is not something quite new among Dissenters in Mr. Paxton Hood's manner of speaking of the Catholic Church.

Of medieval preachers generally, he says:—

"I am sorry to agree with Dr. Neale when he affirms that there was an immense and intuitive knowledge of Scripture possessed by those preachers, setting them, in those particulars, far above the preachers of our own or of any times since the Reformation; there was a perfect affluence of Scripture reference in them, very instructive" (p. 134).

"It is impossible to forbear interest in the magical effect of the harangues of St. Anthony of Padua, and the spell of holiness which even now seems to attract in the life and words of St. Bonaventure" (p. 136).

He has words of admiration for St. Adalbert of Prussia, John Corvinus, the missionary to the Tartars, St. Gall, St. Bernardine of Siena, St. Philip Neri, who "preached a sermon on non-residence before Pope Gregory, and thirty bishops, it is said, started to their episcopates the next day." He gives a brief but enthusiastic account of the Jesuit Father Segueri.

"I admire Segneri; it is impossible—even reading, and reading through a translation—not to be carried away irresistibly by his earnestness" (p. 149).

On St. Bernard he dwells for thirty-five pages, with an admiration as hearty as if he were a Catholic. Of St. Charles Borromeo, he writes,

"It was St. Charles Borromeo—a great example for us all—every way a Cardinal, but a great Sunday-school teacher, perhaps the first of Sunday-school teachers, a beautiful and blessed labourer among the poor, &c." (p. 440).

In his lecture on the formation of style, he recommends especially two Catholic writers, the Abbé Mullois's "Clergy and Pulpit in their Relations to the People," and the Rev. Thomas J. Potter's "Sacred Eloquence," quoting freely from the former.

He is not afraid to speak with glowing eulogy of the preaching of Father Newman, and the Archbishop of Westminster, though he only refers to their Protestant sermons. He devotes seventeen pages to Father Lacordaire, of whose conferences at Notre Dame he says:—

"I will suppose (them) to be in all my hearers' hands; to me they have been long familiar, and . . . they may be mentioned as the most admirable grappling-line thrown from the modern pulpit over the consciousness of the intelligent and cultivated mind of the present generation" (p. 677).

Of Lacordaire's connection and parting with Lamennais, our author says:—

"The sentiments of De Lamennais were developing in a direction where Lacordaire was not likely to follow. The first had the shapeless and indefinite longings of free impulses, but Lacordaire was a Christian, a priest, and a child of the Church. . . . The two Abbés parted company then; the course of De Lamennais certainly was disastrous. I believe his honest endeavour was to *see*. Lacordaire said, 'the Church does not say to you *see*; this power does not belong to her; she says to you *believe*,' and Lacordaire was right. It may seem strange that I find so much that touches my sympathy in the course taken by a Popish priest. In fact, while our reasons may differ, it strikes us that all intelligent

minds reach a point in their history when they have to summon themselves to a determination like that which claimed and compelled Lacordaire either to plunge on thoughtlessly through what seems to be the light, as though light alone gave the power of seeing, and then to hand over the spirit to what the Abbé well styled the most fearful bondage of all, 'the bondage of the mind,' or to take shelter, as he took shelter, in the conviction that as there exists in the world a necessity for a power to protect the weak mind against the strong mind, God has appointed it, not in seeking for peace and liberty along the highway of grief and slavery, but in prayer and in the offices of the Church. . . . It might be well for all of us if we had some centre to which we felt we owed the debt of religious obedience" (pp. 673-674).

Mr. Paxton Hood can afford to speak with kindly appreciation and admiration even of existing religious communities.

"My readers will not suspect me of Papal bearings and tendencies, but it is in that (the Catholic) Church, which numbers assuredly holy, blessed, and devoted men amongst its members, we must look for illustrations of the *instinct for souls*. Catholic Home Missions are very successful."

After speaking of the requirements for this success, and their absence amongst Protestants, he continues:—

"Alas! what would the brothers of the Oratory say to an attempt to win over England to Popery and Rome, conducted after this fashion? Instead of that they try the method of the Pauline madness—'beside themselves,'—snatches of profane song made sacred; walking to and fro in courts and alleys and out-of-the-way nooks; winning by a strong word accompanied by a kind smile, by a lightning-like truth conveyed at the end of an almost entertaining anecdote; and so in the course of a year or two, behold a Church, a Cathedral, and Rome flourishing in that neighbourhood. This goes on while we twaddle upon committees, and read minutes of the last meeting, and get out reports, and wonder who will subscribe. And where are the reports of all the Roman Catholic affiliations? What printer prints them? Where are the magazines that glorify them? The thing rises as silently as a fog, creeps up like an autumn mist over the whole landscape. Gentlemen who are interested in these matters . . . would do very well to read the late Father Faber's essay on Catholic Home Missions."

And then follows the well-known anecdote of Père Morcain, from Father Faber's "Home Missions," quoted with genuine admiration (p. 439).

So again:—

"Remarkably, in this department of plain speaking the Roman Catholics are before us. The work of the Methodist revival is being done by the children of St. Philip Neri, the Oratorians.\* These are the only people almost who preach to the poor. What do Independents, or Baptists, or, for that matter, the Old Methodists either, know about preaching to the poor—the very poor. Our chapels and churches are, for

---

\* It is evidently only imperfect acquaintance with the secular clergy and other religious bodies that has led the author to give this exclusive praise to

the most part, it is to be feared, luxuries they cannot afford; and if we send ministers down to the alleys and low courts, we do not send as Rome sends, gentlemen and men of genius, with a presence of dignity and a heart of affection; we make the great mistake of sending those who, while they possess frequently the coarseness which repels, do not carry along with it the sweetness and the dignity which would affect and command" (p. 29).\*

Mr. Paxton Hood is far from maintaining this tone consistently, but we do not draw attention to the many passages throughout the book which might be taken as a set-off to those we have quoted, in which the familiar expressions consecrated by the great Protestant tradition are used, attributing superstition, bigotry, cruelty, &c., to Catholic faith, institutions, or persons. We cannot forget the way in which many, now fervent children of the Church, thought it right to speak of Catholics, whilst the Oxford movement was bringing them nearer and nearer to the true fold. We are content to rejoice at the new victories which must be in store for the faith in England, if once the educated mind of the immense body of Dissenters can be brought face to face with Catholic history, theology, and sanctity. One swallow does not make a summer: but we cannot be mistaken in supposing that a series of lectures first addressed to a College of Students for the Ministry, and then published to the world, must express much more than the individual views of one man.

---

*La Somme des Conciles Généraux et Particuliers.* Par L'ABBE GUYOT.  
2 vols. Paris: Victor Palmé. 1868.

THIS is likely to prove a very useful summary. The Councils are undoubtedly the most important facts of Church history. But they seldom receive the study they deserve, partly because, taking them altogether, few students have patience to wade through the thick tomes in which they are contained, and partly because every manual of history professes to give something like a summary of their acts and decisions. Such a summary, necessary enough to give completeness to an historical compilation, and sufficient for a general view, becomes worse than useless for the minute study of a particular period. Moreover, all who are in the habit of using Church histories know that compilers have a bad habit of copying each other, an evil which often results in the stereotyping of some particular view or mistake. The more the exact text of the several Councils is brought under the eye of readers, the more secure will they feel themselves in forming conclusions. Not that the mere text of the Councils is sufficient; a complete and clear commentary is also necessary

---

\* The author makes a kindly reference to this Review, as "almost the only one of our higher order of Reviews" which has formed what he considers a respectful "estimate, in substance kindly expressed," of Mr. Spurgeon. The article to which he refers, was in the first series of the DUBLIN REVIEW.

to guide the enquirer ; for no Council can speak with half its fulness of meaning when its accompanying circumstances are not half understood. Whilst waiting for some one to translate into English or French the most valuable *Concilien geschichte* of Dr. Hefele, we may thank the author of the compilation before us for supplying in a handy shape the wants we have pointed out.

In a preliminary essay, the Abbé Guyot explains at some length what a Councils, who may assist at it, who may vote in it, who presides over it, when it is Œcumenical, and in what sense its decrees are infallible. At the present moment such a treatise is extremely useful. It is pleasing to find that the author is quite clear on the subject of the relations between the Pope and a Council. He fully agrees with the following words of De Maistre, which are worth reproducing here. "We know well that the gates of hell will not prevail against the Church ; but why ? On account of Peter, on whom she is founded. Take away this foundation, and how can she be infallible, since she no longer exists ? To be infallible, or anything else, she must first *be*. Let us never forget that no promise has ever been made to the Church apart from her head ; and, remember this, reason itself must conclude that, since the Church is a moral body, and therefore *one* body, the promise can only have been made to unity, and there cannot be unity without the Pope." (*Du Pape*, l. 1, c. 2).

The author does not follow the strict chronological order in dealing with the Councils. He prefers to group them round a fact or a heresy, or to assemble several minor Councils round the Œcumenical Synod to which they relate. He is, we need not say, a most loyal Catholic, though not by any means an exaggerated partisan. Once or twice, indeed, he seems to err slightly by defect ; for instance, in his account of the Nicene Council, he says it was convoked by Constantine *with the consent* of Pope Sylvester. The express words of the Sixth General Council might have authorized him to say that it was convoked by the Emperor *and* the Pope ; and there is no doubt that the Pope's instrument in the matter was Hosius of Cordova.

---

*The New Testament Narrative in the Words of the Sacred Writers.*  
Translated according to the Vulgate, with Notes, Maps, Chronological  
and other Tables. London : Burns & Oates. 1868.

**T**HIS little book contains a narrative of the Life of our Lord and the Acts of the Apostles, compiled as far as possible from the words of the New Testament itself, without comment or abridgment. An introductory chapter contains some useful remarks on the authorship, design, and characteristics of the four Gospels, and a chronological analysis of the events of Holy Week. The book is also furnished with lists of miracles, prophecies quoted from the Old Testament, parables classified according to the truths illustrated by them, and chronological tables and maps. The text is neatly printed, and the whole well arranged and brought out in a form very useful for school use.

As, however, the compilation is evidently designed as an elementary



work for the young, we regret to find traces here and there of too great reference to Protestant authorities. It is a pity, we think, when so much has been done by recent writers on the Gospel chronology and harmony, that our youth should be continually reminded of Robinson, Greswell, and Alford, rather than made familiar with the great names amongst Catholics. For the same reason we should prefer to adhere closely to our old traditional words and spellings, even to a letter, when sanctioned by the Vulgate. In the book before us there are signs of haste, and slips which might have been avoided by a more careful revision, such as the frequent occurrence of *Isaiah* for *Isaias*. Why should we not also keep to the *Pasch* instead of the *Passover*? and why, by the use of Hughes' maps, should we have to retain *Joppa*, *Capernaum*, and *Beersheba*? Moreover, the very brief explanatory notes occasionally met with in the volume are, we fear, somewhat misleading. For instance, a discrepancy between the Evangelists is roundly stated in p. 140, without a hint being given that it is only apparent, or an attempt at a solution of the difficulty. Is there not some confusion, too, in the chronological table, where the birth of our Lord is assigned to the year B.C. 4, and the annunciation to the preceding year B.C. 5? Again, in a note to the words of our Lord, "That which my Father hath given me is greater than all" (S. John x. 29), the remark is appended, "Or, as it is in the Greek, 'My Father who hath given them to me is greater than all'" (p. 118). Now we should object in any case to such a vague reference to "the Greek" as an authority in opposition to a Vulgate reading, but it so happens in this particular instance that, critically speaking, it is more than doubtful if "the Greek" contains anything of the sort. A reference to Professor Ornsby's valuable edition of the Vatican codex might have warned our author that at least there was one very respectable Greek authority in favour of the Latin reading of the Vulgate. For the Vatican by itself is of no small weight, and when supported as it is by other ancient Greek manuscripts, the old "*Itala*," and the testimony of Tertullian, Ambrose, and Augustine, it is not surprising that it should induce such critics as even Alford and Tregelles among Protestants to adopt the Vulgate reading. In fact we have here a very good example of what is familiar enough to textual critics, that fresh discoveries and a more scientific criticism are constantly tending to prove the value of the old Latin readings in preference to the modern *Textus receptus*.

A mistaken judgment in a matter of mere scholarship would be of little consequence in itself in a book of this sort, but it becomes a real evil when it helps to perpetuate a blind tradition in favour of an exploded text, which nowadays even the most prejudiced Protestants are learning to mistrust. We think it a pity that our youth should not be trained, even in the least details of study, to look to Catholic guides and Catholic traditions.

---

*The Liturgical Year.* By DOM P. GUÉRANGER, Abbot of Solesmes. Translated by DOM LAURENCE SHEPHERD, Monk of the English Benedictine Congregation. Vol. I. Advent. Vols. II. III. Christmas. Dublin and London: Duffy. 1867-8.

THE two Christmas volumes of this admirable translation of Dom Guéranger's *Année Liturgique*, will doubtless be in the hands of many of our readers before this notice appears. Liturgy in England is now in a position to make its influence felt. We have got beyond the days when the mere essentials of Catholic worship were all that could be aimed at, and have happily arrived at times when the august ceremonial of the Church may be studied with as much profit by those who attend at it, as it is conducted with solicitous decorum by those who are its ministers. The present Ritualistic controversy in England, which is stirring questions far deeper than its name imports, has made the question of liturgical forms, in its widest sense, familiar to most Englishmen. On the one hand there is the party which wars against all liturgy as superstitious, or scoffs at it as unnecessary and childish. We believe it is the truth that the first thoughts of the mass of the English middle class, when they think of vestments, of incense, or of genuflections, are thoughts of contemptuous disparagement. They have been bred up to look at these things as superstitious. The logical reason for such a posture of mind, is their inability to see any necessity for such a thing as outward worship; and the cause of this inability, though few would acknowledge so much, is, the slenderness of their conviction, that any worship whatever, as distinct from the practice of certain human virtues, is a precept of either natural or positive law. But another real reason why so many respectable people sneer at ritual observance, is their utter ignorance of Church traditions, and the density of their darkness regarding the meaning of the simplest ceremonies. It is quite true to say that man is naturally attracted by a beautiful ceremony, or a symbolical action. But this is true, first, only of men whose minds have not been educated in a perverse direction; and secondly, only of ceremonies and rites whose meaning is extremely clear and apparent. An ignorant Catholic, brought up in his faith, will be unable even to comprehend the ridicule of his Protestant neighbour; and the Protestant neighbour, with a real attempt to be charitable, will fail to see how a man can honestly consider it a meritorious act to sprinkle himself with water.

The ridicule of the ignorant multitude is, doubtless, provoking enough; and all the more so, because, like certain pachydermatous animals, it seems so utterly impervious to argument. But there is another state of mind on this subject, not indeed by any means as deplorable, but still very bad, both in itself and in its effects. Ignorance on the part of devout believers is a great evil to the believers themselves, because it deprives them of much instruction and consolation, and of many incentives to piety. It is even more disastrous in its effects on the outside world of unbelievers, because these last are sure to come into frequent

contact with it ; and whenever they do so, the apparent blindness and unreasoning bigotry which it displays seems almost to be a justification of their own hostility. And, what is the worst of all, the ignorant believer himself, in no long time, becomes sensibly affected by the criticisms and sneers he is continually hearing.

The ignorance here spoken of is by no means confined to the lowest class, such as the poor Irish who throng our chapels. It is found among them, and it tends, perhaps, to generate superstition and a certain irregular enthusiasm. But it is found, in a far more aggravated form, in classes that ought to know better. There is nothing more painful than to see moderately educated Catholics ashamed of the religious ceremonies of their worship ; and it is a thing by no means uncommonly seen. Now, to be ashamed of one's worship may arise from various causes ; but as often as not it comes from mere ignorance and unfamiliarity. A grand and worldwide institution, like the Church, with her centuries of history and her vast developments in every age, needs some little study before she is thoroughly understood. Minute ramifications of her system are inexplicable by themselves ; isolated acts are meaningless in their isolation ; insignificant forms require sometimes the light of a bygone century to show them in their true colours. But in proportion as the eye takes in the whole Catholic temple, in the length of its years, the breadth of its peoples and tongues, the depth of its doctrines and height of its heavenward tendencies, the mind comes to see that the darkest ceremony is part of an awful creation, and that the least ritual act has a tradition at its back that stirs the blood and sets the heart on fire.

The work of the celebrated Abbot of Solesmes, now presented by an English Benedictine Father in such an attractive English dress, is a work that is very much needed. No tongue can express (and tongues more eloquent than ours have often attempted the task) the blessings of which the Holy Liturgy is the channel to man. Nothing can be more solid, or more fruitful.

We wish we had space to quote largely from F. Shepherd's translation. But we must be satisfied with giving the following abstract of his first volume of Christmas, that our readers may see what they have to expect. The first Christmas volume contains the History, Mystery, and Practice of Christmas ; seventy Hymns, &c., from the Ancient Liturgies ; Christmas Day—a hundred and twenty pages of instruction in all that relates to the feast, including the Services, &c. The Saints' feasts occurring from December 26 to January 5. These feasts give rise to instructions on Virginity, Martyrdom, Innocence, Liberty of the Church, &c. The Feast of the Circumcision ; its liturgy meaning, importance, &c. Mary's innocence, dignity as Mother of God. A Prayer from an Ancient Rite on New Year's Day. Letter written by an Archdeacon of Bath, immediately after the death of S. Thomas of Canterbury.

This bare enumeration is better than any recommendation we can give.

---

# THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1869.

---

## ART. I.—MR. FFOULKES'S LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING.

*The Church's Creed, or the Crown's Creed? A Letter to the Most Reverend Archbishop Manning.* By EDMUND S. FFOULKES. London: Hayes.

THIS last pamphlet of Mr. Ffoulkes's has made a very great "sensation" in the Protestant world, and is indeed a conspicuous specimen of what may be called "sensational" theology. Alas, that two such words should be brought together! Alas, that at a time when the public is growing weary of the sensational element in secular literature, the same spirit should invade the domain of sacred study itself! Yet such is the fact. A self-styled Catholic, denouncing the Holy See and denying the unity, authority, and infallibility of the Church, is a fine "sensational figure" in the presence of a Protestant public. Well, be it so. Let Mr. Ffoulkes have his eleven or twelve editions. Let newspaper critics set to work, that they may master in one afternoon some among the most difficult passages of Catholic dogma and history; and that they may have the condensed essence of the result, ready for presentation at breakfast-time next morning. Let every Catholic, who happens to be lax in faith and shaky in loyalty to the Church, have the opportunity of commending himself to the world; of declaring that he does not indeed entirely agree with Mr. Ffoulkes, but that there is a great deal which any Catholic may legitimately say on that side the question, and that the pamphlet is calculated to promote true Catholic interests. We grudge no part of this to Mr. Ffoulkes; for *we* also think that Catholic interests will be promoted by his pamphlet. They will be promoted, were it only by its illustrating the utter worthlessness and unmeaningness of those fitful anti-Catholic clamours, which are ever suddenly starting up here in England and as suddenly dying away. The history of this pamphlet affords a memorable instance, how great temporary popularity may be obtained by one, who fails equally and utterly in all three parts of logic—in simple apprehension,

in judgment, in reasoning—if he will only demean himself to the very easy task, of turning king's evidence against the aggressive and unpopular Catholic Church; and of insulting and maligning her, while he professes himself a member of her communion.

If Dr. Pusey indeed had written such a pamphlet as this, every one would have said how deplorably it falls short of even Dr. Pusey's controversial average, and there would have been an end. Mr. Ffoulkes, as we pointed out in our last number, is no more a Roman Catholic in creed than Dr. Pusey is; but he deludes outsiders into the notion, that here is a "candid Papist," who cannot shut his eyes to his Church's "corruptions and abuses." He confesses indeed that "when the Popes made fellowship with their errors indispensable to fellowship with their See, . . . . the only course left was to abandon both": intending this in defence of the Photians. Yet certainly Pius IX. makes "fellowship with his errors" just as "indispensable to fellowship with his See," as did any of his predecessors; whereas Mr. Ffoulkes, instead of "abandoning both," rejects the doctrine of Rome while clinging to "fellowship with her See."

We should not inflict on our readers those dull and lengthy disquisitions which any theological reply to Mr. Ffoulkes must involve, if externs understood the light in which that gentleman is regarded by Catholics. But we are bound to criticise this pamphlet, for the sake of sincere religious inquirers. We well know what trifles are magnified into serious objections, when such a man is trembling on the brink, and doubting whether he is really bound to break with all the past traditions of his life. In charity therefore to such men, we will take more notice of the writer before us than he deserves; and we will show them what sort of guide they would follow, if they accounted him an authority on things theological. The Protestant world has been loud in its complaint, that Catholics have indulged in vague declamation against the author, instead of grappling with his theological arguments. Surely it is most reasonable to "declaim" against a traitor in the camp; against one who uses his external position as a professing Catholic, to injure the Catholic Church. For ourselves however we shall, as Protestants wish, deal mainly with his theological reasoning, if in courtesy it may so be called; though no one can feel more strongly than we do, how great a claim we are making on the patience and diligent attention of those who care to follow our remarks. It is no fault of ours, that Mr. Ffoulkes has chosen, for his fantastic treatment, themes which require careful handling. To our reader's

painstaking consideration then, whether he be Catholic or Protestant, we now appeal.

The author's central argument turns on the Catholic dogma of the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son. Under this head, two accusations of most disproportionate magnitude have been brought against the Roman Pontiffs. The heavier of these alleges, that the Popes have, for many centuries, required their spiritual subjects to believe with divine faith a dogma, which is not certainly revealed, nor even certainly true. The other accusation, utterly trivial in comparison, reproaches them with nothing worse, than having unjustifiably introduced an *expression* of this dogma into the Nicene Symbol. Now the word "creed" is equivocal: sometimes it expresses all the dogmata proposed by the Church as of faith; sometimes it merely signifies a *symbol* of faith, as when we speak of the Nicene or the Athanasian Creed. It is characteristic of Mr. Ffoulkes, that he has been quite bewildered by this equivocation; that he is constantly passing from one sense to the other of this word "creed," without any consciousness of the fallacy. No one however who reads his pamphlet can doubt, that he intends to bring *both* the above-named accusations against the Holy See; and we will therefore consider them both. We will begin with that which is comparatively trivial, and on which a very few words will suffice.

We are to assume then for a moment what is afterwards to be proved; viz., that the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son was a dogma undeniably obligatory on every Catholic as of faith, long before the time of Reccared. And we are to inquire whether, granting that assumption, "Filioque" was legitimately added to the Nicene Symbol. Now if Mr. Ffoulkes merely means to say, that (however excellent their intentions) neither Reccared nor Charlemagne—though acting in fullest harmony with the Catholic bishops of their respective countries—did rightly in making this addition against the wish of successive Pontiffs, we most heartily concur with him.\* Indeed, we congratulate him on feeling so keenly the very serious evils which may arise from national Churches acting independently of Rome. We would only point out, that no Pope ever expressed approval of such conduct, and that we believe our author to be in perfect harmony with the Holy See in condemning it. Undoubtedly the Council of Florence defined that "Filioque" had been

---

\* As to Reccared and his bishops, they had no reason (so far as we are aware) for even suspecting that the Holy See disapproved their addition to the Symbol.



“lawfully and reasonably added to the Symbol.” And Mr. Ffoulkes indeed (p. 18) regards this definition as teaching, that such addition had been lawfully and reasonably made by *Reccared and Charlemagne*. But the words of the Council, taken by themselves, imply nothing whatever of the kind; while the arguments used at the Council directly *contradict* such an interpretation. The Latin arguments at the Council proceeded on no other basis whatever, than on the *Pope's* power of commanding or sanctioning the addition.

In some places the author does not seem to deny, that the Pope had power of commanding this addition: for he complains that the words “were introduced by stealth” (p. 6) “silently and clandestinely” (p. 10). But he cannot mean, that the Pope had power indeed to *command* it, but no power tacitly to *permit* it; and we must therefore pass over such expressions, as only indicating Mr. Ffoulkes's confusion of thought.

This particular question therefore of adding to the Symbol, resolves itself into the more general question, whether the Pope is or is not, by divine appointment, the Church's absolutely supreme ruler on earth. This, we say, and no other, is the precise point at issue. If the Pope do possess this office, he most unquestionably has full power of commanding or permitting, that the authorized expression of a revealed dogma be recited or chanted in the Symbol. Let us even suppose that, as some have most groundlessly thought, a disciplinary canon had been passed at Ephesus forbidding every such addition: still that canon must derive its whole obligatory force from the will of the Church's supreme ruler, and could be repealed at his pleasure. Meanwhile we on our side are the first to admit, that if the Holy See have *not* received from God this plenitude of authority, we can offer no defence whatever, either for the “Filioque” or for a thousand other exercises of Pontifical authority. But as this whole question of Papal supremacy is to be considered in a later part of our article with reference to the False Decretals, we shall here say no more about it.

The historical facts, connected with the addition to the Symbol, were recited at sufficient length in our last number (pp. 255-6). The bearing of these facts we take to be as follows:—A pious custom began in Spain and spread gradually through several European countries, of expressing the Church's undoubted dogma by chanting “Filioque” in the Symbol. For some reason, on which in the sequel we shall offer a conjecture, the Holy See judged this custom inexpedient and tried to check it. Successive Popes however had here a difficult and anxious task; for it is always a very anxious thing, to discourage an expression in itself legitimate of orthodox

dogma, which commends itself to the pious instinct of the people. They never therefore proceeded to the length of forbidding it under pain of sin; and, as time went on and the custom struck deeper root, they came to think that (such being the case) less harm than good would follow from giving it their sanction. There is no need to consider whether the custom were "lawful and reasonable" at its first adoption; we think that it was not: but at all events it had become "reasonable" when they sanctioned it, and became "lawful" by the very fact of their sanction.

We are now however to enter on an inquiry immeasurably more grave: viz., whether the assumption on which we have hitherto gone is well founded; whether this dogma be really obligatory as of faith. In p. 19 (as we pointed out in January) the author expresses his own personal opinion, that the Holy Ghost does *not* proceed from the Son; and at all events he is very confident that the Church has no power to teach this Procession as of faith. For such a statement he assigns two reasons; the first being derived from the well-known seventh canon of Ephesus. This canon indeed may be called the one key-note of his whole pamphlet; and we will not fail therefore to give it full consideration.

It must be admitted that really able anti-Catholics, and not merely Mr. Ffoulkes, have tried to make controversial capital out of this canon. Lord Macaulay e.g., in his "History of England" (vol. iii. p. 474), says that "it is difficult to imagine stronger or clearer language than that" of this canon, in condemnation of the Athanasian Creed: insomuch that "whoever uses that Creed must, in the very act of uttering an anathema against his neighbours, bring down an anathema on his own head." This is tall talk: but how stand the *facts*? The whole decree runs as follows in the Latin translation, which represents the original with sufficient faithfulness.

His igitur perlectis, statuit Sancta Synodus, alteram fidem nemini licere proferre, aut conscribere, aut componere, præter definitam a Sanctis Patribus, qui in Nicæâ cum Spiritu Sancto congregati fuerunt. Qui vero ausi fuerint aut componere fidem alteram, aut proferre, vel offerre converti volentibus ad agnitionem veritatis, sive ex gentilitate, sive ex Judaismo, sive ex qualicumque hæresi; hos quidem, si sunt episcopi aut clerici, alienos esse episcopos ab episcopatu, et clericos a clericatu decrevit: si vero laici fuerint, anathemati subjici.

Simili etiam modo si qui inventi fuerint, vel episcopi, vel clerici, vel laici, sive sentire sive docere ea quæ continentur in oblatâ expositione a Charisio presbytero de Unigeniti Filii Dei Incarnatione, *sive scelerata et perversa Nestorii dogmata* quæ et subnexa sunt, subjaceant sententiæ Sanctæ

hujus et Universalis Synodi : ut videlicet episcopus quidem removeatur ab episcopatu, et sit depositus ; clericus vero similiter excedat a clericatu : si vero laicus quis sit, et ipse anathematizetur, sicut superius dictum est.

For reasons which will presently appear, we begin with considering the precise force of this *last* paragraph. It might appear on first reading, that the *bishops and clerics* here denounced are to be visited with no severer penalty than that of *deposition*, while the punishment of *anathematization* is reserved exclusively for *laymen*. But such an interpretation will not hold water for a moment. We need not dwell on the absolute incredibility of such an idea, as that laymen were to be punished for heresy more severely than bishops and clerics ; or again that any men were denounced by an Œcumenical Council as heretics, and yet not anathematized. Apart from this, it is admitted by all, that “the wicked and perverse dogmata of Nestorius,” with all their upholders, were anathematized at Ephesus. Indeed S. Cyril’s well-known anathemas against them are recounted by the Lateran Council under S. Martin I., not as S. Cyril’s anathemas at all, but as those “of the Ephesine Council.” The sense of this paragraph is therefore indubitable. Those *bishops and clerics* who follow Nestorius are not only anathematized, but (as a visible sign of their anathematization) are removed from their position in the Church. Even heretical *laymen* are *anathematized*, though they hold no office from which they *can* be deposed. Indeed the conjunction “et,” just at the end of the paragraph, indicates this. If a Nestorian be a layman, let “even” him be anathematized, though he cannot be deposed. It may be added, that the Acts of this very Council exhibit many instances, in which the word “deposition” is mentioned by itself, where it most undeniably includes anathematization.

Now then as to the *preceding* paragraph, on which our main argument is to turn. All who employ this canon against Catholics,—and Mr. Ffoulkes emphatically—represent the preposition “præter,” “παρὰ,” to mean “over and above,” “in addition to,” the Nicene “fides.” But it is a matter for extreme surprise that such a view can remain at this day, considering the overwhelming refutation given it by Cardinal Julian in the eleventh Session of Florence. Petavius does not hesitate to say (de Trinitate, l. 7, c. 9, s. 3) that he can himself add nothing to the Cardinal’s exhaustive and unanswerable disquisition. Even before that disquisition, it is unintelligible how any one can have read a narrative of what took place at Ephesus, and retain any doubt on the sense of the canon.

The preposition “*παρὰ*” most indubitably signifies, not “*beyond*” or “in addition to,” but “*against*” or “contrary to.” The facts are these:—

A certain presbyter named Charisius presented a memorial to the Council of Ephesus. This memorial mentions the misdeeds of two certain Nestorian presbyters, who circumvented some among the more simple-minded clerics of Philadelphia: they made of no account the Nicene Symbol, adds the memorial, but placed before these clerics a different exposition of faith, “or rather of infidelity;” an exposition indeed “filled with heretical blasphemy.” The memorial exhibits an authentic copy of this heretical exposition; and Charisius concludes, in order to show his own orthodoxy, by reciting his personal belief. This he does in the following words, to which we beg our reader's careful attention.

Credo in Unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem omnium, visibilium et invisibilium Factorem. Et in Unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Ejus Unigenitum; Deum de Deo; Lumen de Lumine; Deum Verum de Deo Vero; Consubstantialem Patri. Qui propter nos et nostram salutem descendit de coelis, et incarnatus est, et ex Sanctâ Virgine natus, et homo factus est: crucifixus pro nobis, mortuus est: resurrexit tertiâ die, ascendit in coelos, et iterum venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Veritatis, Paracletum, Patri et Filio Consubstantialem: et in sanctam Catholicam Ecclesiam, in mortuorum resurrectionem, in vitam æternam.

It is evident at once that Charisius himself did that very thing, which anti-Catholics consider to have been immediately afterwards prohibited by the Council; for he “brought forward, wrote and composed” a symbol, differently expressed from the Nicene. The doctrine was identical, but the words different. Without dwelling on the numerous minor discrepancies which our readers will have observed;—the words “Consubstantial with Father and Son” were added, which occur neither in the Nicene Symbol nor in its Constantinopolitan amplification. What he complained of was, not that certain Nestorians had *worded* the Nicene dogmata *differently*,—for he himself was doing that very thing,—but that they taught the Nestorian heresy under pretence of proposing Catholic dogma.

All this is made still clearer, by the words with which Peter of Alexandria introduced Charisius's memorial. We put into *italics* those sentences, which pointedly resemble in wording the canon passed immediately afterwards.

A presbyter (he says), Charisius by name, has set forth that certain Lydian heretics, having deserted the error under which they lay, had

been desirous of returning to the light of truth, and being instructed in the right and pious dogmata of the Catholic Church : but that when they ought to have been directed to the Truth, they had [on the contrary] gone still more grievously astray, and fallen, as it were, from one pit to another more disastrous. For he has set forth that a certain Anthony and James, being in the rank of presbyters, had come down from Constantinople with commendatory letters from one Anastasius and one Photius, who were then adherents of the heretic Nestorius, and who were also in the rank of presbyters. And when—to those who were *turning from error to truth* and who sought to come from darkness to light—that evangelical and apostolical *tradition of faith should have been proposed which the Fathers assembled at Nicæa formerly set forth*, [these heretics] brought forward a certain exposition of impious dogmata *which had been drawn up in the form of a symbol*, and induced these unhappy men to sign it.

Immediately after this speech, there were read in the Council (1) Charisius's memorial ; (2) his own symbol of faith ; (3) the Nestorian exposition which had been palmed on these unfortunate Philadelphians ; and (4) their subscription to the said exposition. The Acts then immediately proceed, as we quoted at starting, “His igitur perlectis, &c. &c. ;” and we beg our readers again to look at the whole decree. If Mr. Ffoulkes will only admit that a conclusion has some relation to its premisses, it will be impossible even for *him* to misunderstand what was done. Complaint had been made of a dogmatic exposition, contrary to the Nicene Faith, having been insidiously proposed to certain men who were returning from heresy ; and the Council accordingly decreed, that no such iniquitous transaction should again be attempted. It did not ascribe the least blame to the conduct of even private *presbyters*, who should express the Nicene Faith *in other words* than those of Nicæa ; for Charisius, who had done this very thing, was (if we may so speak) the very hero of the occasion. Never was anything more clear and indubitable. *Mr. Ffoulkes's* mistake indeed is easily enough explained, by the very peculiar constitution of his intellect. But how as to Lord Macaulay ? No doubt he never took the trouble of looking at the story ; though it would not have taken him ten minutes to do so. Any stick is good enough to beat a dog with ; and he was not particular in his choice of arguments, when he wished to attack dogmatic religion.

It will be admitted by every Greek scholar, that our interpretation of the canon involves no kind of violence to the language ; and indeed is fully as obvious and natural as any other. It will be admitted, we say, that the words “*ἑτέραν πίστιν παρὰ τὴν ὀρισθεῖσαν*” can in no way be more obviously translated, than as signifying “a different exposi-

tion of faith *at variance with* that defined" at Nicæa. It will be admitted, in fact, that while no other interpretation is *consistent with the circumstances*, no other is *more* naturally suggested by the words.

Our only perplexity in the matter is to imagine what can be the perplexity. One solution of this perplexity has occurred to us, though we know not whether it have any foundation of fact. It has occurred to us as possible, that some may have felt *this* difficulty. According to the sense we have given, the canon is directed against actual heretics; for of course to contravene the Nicene Faith is heresy. Now on its surface the canon does not seem to anathematize those *bishops and clerics* who offend against it, but only those *laymen* who do so. It cannot therefore be—so the objection would run—that offenders against the canon are ipso facto heretics.

But the reply to such an objection is most easy: indeed the wording of the canon furnishes us with an independent and even strong argument on our side. Let our readers peruse the whole decree, as we printed it at starting: they will at once recognize as most evident, that the condemnation expressed in the *first* paragraph is precisely equivalent with that expressed in the *second*. The very words are identical: nay attention is called to the identity, both by the expression "*Simili etiam modo*" with which the second paragraph commences, and by the expression "*sicut superius dictum est*" with which it concludes. Now the condemnation in the *second* paragraph is, beyond all possible question, directed against actual heretics; against those who teach Nestorius's "*perverse and crooked dogmata*." This reason then, even though it stood alone, would show that the condemnation in the *first* paragraph is *also* directed against heretics; and in no respect against those, who merely express orthodox doctrine in a novel phraseology. And we showed some pages back, that the bishops and clerics mentioned were by no means *exempt* from that anathema, which was expressly pronounced on heretical laymen.

Here then is the sum and substance of this very simple canon, which has served Mr. Ffoulkes as the chief material for his sensational romance. "If any one shall dare to draw up a symbol of faith—or to place before converts one already drawn up—which contradicts the dogma defined at Nicæa, he shall be anathematized," says the Council, "and if a cleric also deposed": because so to act sufficiently manifests internal heresy.

The Council of Chalcedon used words almost identical with those of the Ephesine canon; though here the prohibition



does not refer merely to the Nicene or even the Constantinopolitan Symbol, but to the dogmatic definition of Chalcedon itself. It runs thus :—

His igitur cum omni undique exactâ curâ et diligentîâ a nobis dispositis, definivit sancta et universalis synodus, alteram fidem nulli licere proferre aut conscribere vel componere, aut sentire aut alios docere. Eos autem qui audent componere fidem alteram, aut proferre aut docere, aut tradere alterum symbolum volentibus ad agnitionem veritatis converti vel ex gentilitate vel ex Judaismo vel ex hæresi quâcunque ; hos si episcopi fuerint aut clerici alienos esse, episcopos ab episcopatu et clericos a clero : si vero monachi aut laici fuerint, anathematizari eos (pp. 43, 44).

The sense of this decree is of course to be determined by that of the Ephesine : it deposes and anathematizes all, who shall draw up any exposition of faith at variance with the Chalcedonian definition.

Subsequent definitions show demonstratively that the view which we have given is the one traditional view. Mr. Ffoulkes understands this Chalcedonian canon as enacting irreversibly, that no converts shall at any future time be required to accept any definition of faith beyond the Constantinopolitan Symbol (p. 13 et alibi).\* And he has the dulness—in one less misty we should call it the audacity—to allege the Fifth and Sixth Councils as “confirming” his interpretation (p. 13). Why, both the Fifth and Sixth Councils imposed fresh definitions of faith themselves ; thereby unmistakably showing, that they took a view of the Chalcedonian canon directly contradictory to Mr. Ffoulkes’s. And as to this canon itself, both Councils seemed resolved there should be no misunderstanding of the sense in which they adopted it. For they both avoided the ambiguous word “*παρά*,” “*præter*” : the Fifth condemning those only who should teach what is “*contrary*” to their definition, and the Sixth those only who should teach what is “*subversive*” of theirs.†

\* Even on Mr. Ffoulkes’s own showing, the Chalcedonian definition against Eutyches should also be proposed to converts ; for it is on the Chalcedonian and not the Ephesine canon that he takes his stand. But to dwell on all his smaller inconsistencies would occupy a volume.

† The Fifth Council speaks thus :—

“Si quis conatus fuerit *contraria* his, quæ a nobis pie terminata sunt, tradere aut docere aut scribere, si quidem episcopus est, aut in clero connumeratus, talis, extranea et a sacerdotum et ecclesiasticâ disciplinâ peragens, denudabitur ab episcopatu aut clero, si autem monachus aut laicus fuerit, anathematizabitur.” (Denz, n. 186.)

The Sixth, thus :—

“Qui vero præsumpserint fidem alteram componere, vel proferre, vel docere, vel tradere aliud symbolum volentibus converti ad agnitionem veri-

Such is the general history of this canon : and now for our author's comment thereon. As regards indeed the interval of time between Ephesus and Chalcedon, we admit that he says no more than abler men have said ; amazed as we must be at their having said it. He admits that, during this period, the canon was purely disciplinary. Still according to him—as we pointed out in January (p. 254)—during this interval of time, it was not only unlawful for a bishop to teach converts as of faith that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, but it was equally unlawful to teach them as of faith the Constantinopolitan definition, that He proceeds from the Father. For the Nicene Symbol, as recited at Ephesus, is no less absolutely silent on the *latter* doctrine than it is on the *former*.

It is with the period of Chalcedon however, that our author's sensationalism arrives at its full climax ; that his victory, over all competitors in paradox, triumphantly culminates. In his view, the Chalcedonian decree which we just now recited includes a dogmatic definition. This decree, he thinks, (1) infallibly declares, that under no future circumstances while the world lasts could any further definition of faith become lawful ; (2) pronounces sentence of deposition on any Pope, bishop, or cleric, who should ever, at any future time, compose or use any further definition ; and (3) anathematizes all laymen who should ever commit a similar offence.

Our readers have already seen the very simple and intelligible decree, which the author's wild imagination thus incredibly perverts ; and we entreat them once more to look at its very simple and unmistakable wording. In January (p. 254) we looked at the thing on its historical side. In comparison with this momentous declaration, which Mr. Ffoulkes has evolved from the depth of his own consciousness and ascribed (as if in some dream) to the Council of Chalcedon,—the mere condemnation of Eutyches would sink into nothing. The one event of Chalcedon, overshadowing all others, would be this infallible declaration, that no further definitions of faith could be lawfully issued. Yet so little was the Church conscious of having put forth this unparalleled announcement, that so soon as fresh heretics arose, she proceeded, as a matter of course, to condemn them by fresh definitions of faith. And to no one throughout Christendom, orthodox or heretic, did the objection occur—during e.g. the whole Monothelite con-

---

tatis ex Gentilitate vel Judaismo, aut ex quâlibet hæresi : aut qui novitatem vocis vel sermonis adinventionem, *ad subversionem* eorum quæ nunc a nobis determinata sunt, introducere : hos siquidem episcopi fuerint aut clerici, alienos esse, episcopos quidem ab episcopatu, clericos vero a clero : sin autem monachi fuerint vel laici, etiam anathematizari eos ” (n. 239).

troversy—that the Church had abdicated at Chalcedon her right of infallibly defining at all. This is a view of which no one ever dreamed, from the very moment when the canon was enacted in the fifth century, until Mr. Ffoulkes arose in the nineteenth to see so clearly through a millstone.

But now look at the thing on its divine and doctrinal side. From the days of the Apostles to those of Chalcedon, according to our author, the Church was infallible. But *after* that time, not only was the gift of infallibility withdrawn, but the Church, by her profane and rebellious additions to her defined creed, has incurred a constantly increased burden of God's heavy wrath. Vigilius was ipso facto deposed, by assenting to the anathemas of the Fifth Council; and since Vigilius there has been no Pope at all: for we need hardly say that a "deposed" Pope is *not* a Pope. Every single Western bishop and priest is deposed;\* not a bishop or priest is there in Italy, Spain, France, Germany, England, who can exercise his functions without transgressing God's grave prohibition. Mr. Ffoulkes has received confirmation from a deposed bishop, and recounts the graces which he has received from the sacramental ministration of deposed priests. Surely he is bound to flee, not from the Roman Catholic Church alone, but from every existing Christian society: for all have added *something* to the Chalcedonian definition, and all are therefore under God's heavy displeasure. We do not see how he can regard salvation as possible, while staying where he is. As was pointed out by an able writer in "Catholic Opinion," every one else may hope to escape under invincible ignorance; for no other person ever dreamed that the canon of Chalcedon had any such astounding signification. Mr. Ffoulkes is the one person living for whom, on his own showing, no such plea is available.

There can be no mistake as to what the author intended to say.† Just as the Church issued various definitions of faith at Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus,—so at Chalcedon, holds the author, she laid down two definitions. Firstly she infallibly condemned Eutyches; and secondly she infallibly defined, that no further definition of faith would ever be permissible. But by the time Mr. Ffoulkes reached p. 37, he had plenty of time to forget what he had written in p. 13; and in

---

\* "Unless this canon is to be construed in a non-natural sense, . . . its operation must extend to every bishop and priest in the West using the Creed of Reccared and Charlemagne": i. e., reciting the words "Filioque" (p. 12).

† For instance. This canon at Chalcedon "became a *dogmatic canon* of as *permanent* and *universal* obligation as the *definition itself* to which it was appended" (p. 13).

p. 37 he declares that "Rome may never have erred from the Faith in point of dogma." He considers it *no error at all* against the Faith in point of dogma, that for more than a thousand years she has continuously exhibited her total disbelief in an infallible dogmatic canon; and that for the same period of time, by constantly issuing new definitions of faith, she has continuously and energetically claimed, both in word and act, a dogmatic infallibility of which she has been totally destitute. All this forsooth "may be no error against the Faith in point of dogma"; but only "*trifling* with the Faith *on one point in practice*"! (p. 37).

So much on this much vexed and ill-used seventh canon of Ephesus. But the author gives also a second reason for holding, that the Church has no power to teach as of faith the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son. This reason is also taken from the definition of Chalcedon. The Constantinopolitan Symbol, says the Council of Chalcedon, "teaches forth the perfect doctrine concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The word ἐκδιδάσκει, "teaches forth," he preposterously translates "teaches explicitly." And then he asks (p. 19), "How can *explicit* teaching, which is perfect, admit of any further explanation," such as the "Filioque"? Here, at starting, we will make one remark. According to our author, the Constantinopolitan Symbol exhaustively defines "the perfect doctrine concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Now the Constantinopolitan Symbol does not expressly say that the Holy Ghost is God. According to Mr. Ffoulkes therefore, "the perfect doctrine concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" may be exhaustively defined, without any express declaration that the Holy Ghost is God! If his argument proved it not to be of faith, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son;—the same identical argument would with equal peremptoriness prove it not to be of faith, that the Holy Ghost is a *Divine Person at all*.

The real fact however is, that the Chalcedonian definition not only does not say what Mr. Ffoulkes so oddly supposes, but does say the precise contradictory; nay, says it with most unmistakable distinctness. To exhibit this, we will place the passage before our readers in its Latin translation. After reciting the Constantinopolitan Symbol, the Council thus proceeds:—

Sufficeret quidem ad plenam cognitionem et confirmationem pietatis hoc sapiens et salutare divinæ gratiæ symbolum; de Patre enim et Filio et Spiritu Sancto perfectionem docet (ἐκδιδάσκει τὸ τέλειον), ac Domini nostri inhumanationem fideliter accipientibus representat. Sed quoniam hi qui veritatis reprobare prædicationem conantur, per proprias hæreses novas voces genuerunt:

alii quidem mysterium dispensationis Domini, quæ propter nos facta est, corrumpere præsumentes, et vocem Theotocos de Virgine dici denegantes : alii autem confusionem et mixtionem introducentes, et unam naturam esse carnis et divinitatis stulte confingentes, et passibilem Unigeniti divinam naturam per confusionem prodigiose dicentes : propter hoc illis omnem machinationem contra veritatem volens claudere, præsens nunc sancta et magna et universalis synodus prædicationem hanc *ab initio immobilem* docens, decrevit ante omnia, *fidem integram et intemeratam permanere trecentorum decem et octo sanctorum patrum* : et confirmat doctrinam quæ de substantiâ Spiritûs Sancti a Patribus centum quinquaginta postea *congregatis in regia civitate* tradita est *propter illos qui Spiritui Sancto repugnabant* quam illi omnibus notam fecerunt : non *quasi aliquid deesset prioribus* adjicientes, sed suum de Sancto Spiritu intellectum, *contra illos qui dominationem Ejus respuere tentaverunt*, Scripturarum testimoniis declarantes : *propter illos autem qui dispensationis mysterium corrumpere conantur*, et purum hominem esse genitum ex sanctâ Virgine Mariâ impudenter delirant, epistolas synodicas beatissimi Cyrilli Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ præsulis ad Nestorium et ad orientales congruenter habentes suscepit *ad convincendas Nestorii insanias* et ad interpretationem eorum qui salutaris symboli pro zelo nôsse volunt *intellectum* : quibus etiam et epistolam magnæ et senioris urbis Romæ præsulis beatissimi et sanctissimi archiepiscopi Leonis, quæ scripta est ad sanctæ memoriæ archiepiscopum Flavianum *ad perimendam Eutychis malam intelligentiam* ; uptote et magni illius Petri confessioni congruentem et communem quamdam columnam existentem *adversus perverse sentientes, ad confirmationem rectorum dogmatum* congruenter aptavit.

Nothing can be clearer than this. The Church's dogma, concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation, was "perfect" and "immovable," says the Council, from the first. The Constantinopolitan Symbol indeed contained an addition to the Nicene, because of the rise of those who denied the Holy Ghost's Divinity ; yet not as though "aught were wanting" in the Nicene. This later Symbol again would have sufficed by itself to teach Catholic dogma, had it not been for the rise of further heretics. When Nestorius however endeavoured to introduce his heretical corruptions, it was necessary to adopt still further expositions, such as those of S. Cyril ; and now that Eutyches is troubling the Church, still further explanations are needed, such as S. Leo gives in his Letter to S. Flavian. The one precise purpose of this passage is to *deny*, that which Mr. Ffoulkes characteristically considers it to *affirm*. The one precise purpose of the passage is to lay down, that whereas the Faith remains identical and unchanged, fresh explanatory definitions are constantly required as fresh circumstances arise.

Having thus disposed of our author's preliminary objections, we now proceed to consider the teaching of the Holy See on

the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son. It cannot be expected indeed that we should transcribe page after page from recognized dogmatical works, which treat with most unexceptionable clearness the whole question: we will only refer to those particulars, which are affected by the pamphlet we are noticing. It will be necessary however to begin, by stating most briefly that dogma, which all Catholics consider to have been taught by the Apostles and to have been retained uninterruptedly in the Church, concerning the Blessed Trinity.

The Three Persons are Co-eternal ; and in speaking therefore on the origination of the Second and Third, we must carefully avoid every such idea as that of succession in *time*. The order of which we shall speak is exclusively the order of nature. Our conceptions indeed undoubtedly proceed in order of time ; but we must be careful to remember, that this order in no way applies to the Verities conceived. Firstly then, we think of God the Father as Alone possessing the one divine intellect and will : secondly, of the Father as generating the Son by an Act of this divine intellect : thirdly, of Father and Son now possessing in common this one divine intellect and will : fourthly, of Father and Son, as one Principle, producing the Holy Ghost by an Act of this divine will : fifthly, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost possessing in common this one divine intellect and will. Thus at length we arrive at an apprehension of the dogma ; most inadequate indeed, through the imperfection of human faculties, but yet true so far as it goes. We apprehend on one hand the origination of the Second and Third Persons ; we apprehend on the other hand the numerical unity of God's nature.

From this exposition we now proceed to draw three inferences, which must be borne in mind by those who would appreciate what is to follow. (1) The Father is the One Primary Principle and Fountain of Deity. (2) The Holy Ghost proceeds mediately from the Father; inasmuch as He proceeds *immediately* from the Son, Who in His turn is originated from the Father. (3) The Holy Ghost also proceeds *immediately* from the Father; inasmuch as He is produced immediately by spiration of the other Two Persons, Who act as One spirating\* Principle.†

This dogma, so far as regards the Holy Ghost's Procession, was explicitly testified by a large number of Fathers, both

\* We hope our readers will pardon this un-English word, for the sake of its obvious convenience.

† "Invenitur Spiritus Sanctus  
est ab Eo, et mediate in quantum  
3, ad 1. See also Petavius de Trinitate, l. 7



Western and Eastern; but the mode of expressing it was different. The Easterns more commonly said that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *through* the Son; the Latins that He proceeds from the Father *and* the Son. The former phrase in its more obvious sense directly states His *mediate* Procession from the Father, and the latter His *immediate* Procession.\* Either phrase again, taken separately, is liable to misconception. The Eastern phrase not only does not declare the Son's indivisible union with the Father in the spirating Act, but may even be understood as denying it: and the Latins at Florence accordingly objected to the phrase, because it might be taken as implying that the Father produces the Holy Ghost through the Son, as through a *channel* or *instrument*.† On the other hand the Western phrase neither expresses the Father's

---

\* “Convenientes enim Latini et Græci in hâc sacro-sanctâ œcumenicâ synodo, magno studio invicem usi sunt, ut inter alia etiam articulus ille de divinâ Spiritûs Sancti Processione summâ cum diligentia et assiduâ inquisitione discuteretur. Prolatis vero testimoniis ex divinis scripturis plurimisque auctoritatibus sanctorum doctorum orientalium et occidentalium, *aliquibus quidem ex Patre et Filio, quibusdam vero ex Patre per Filium procedere dicentibus Spiritum*, et ad eandem intelligentiam aspicientibus omnibus sub diversis vocabulis,—Græci quidem asseruerunt, quod id, quod dicunt Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre procedere, non hâc mente proferunt, ut excludant Filium; sed quia eis videbatur, ut aiunt, Latinos asserere Spiritum ex Patre et Filio procedere tanquam ex duobus principiis et duabus spirationibus, ideo abstinuerunt a dicendo quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre procedat et Filio. Latini vero affirmârunt, non se hâc mente dicere, Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre Filioque procedere, ut excludant Patrem, quin sit Fons ac Principium totius deitatis, Filii scilicet ac Spiritûs Sancti; aut quod id, quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ex Filio, Filius a Patre non habeat; sive quod duo ponant esse principia, seu duas spirationes: sed unum tantum asserant esse principium unicamque spirationem Spiritûs Sancti, prout hactenus asseruerunt. Et cum ex his omnibus unus et idem eliciatur veritatis sensus, tandem in infra scriptam sanctam et Deo amabilem eodem sensu eâdemque mente unionem unanimiter concordârunt et consenserunt. In nomine igitur sanctæ Trinitatis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti, hoc sacro universali approbante Florentino Concilio diffinimus, ut hâc Fidei veritas ab omnibus Christianis credatur et suscipiatur sicque omnes profiteantur, quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio æternaliter est, essentiam suam suumque esse subsistens habet ex Patre simul et Filio, et ex Utroque æternaliter tanquam ab Uno Principio et unicâ spiratione procedit; declarantes quod id quod sancti doctores et patres dicunt, ex Patre per Filium procedere Spiritum Sanctum, ad hanc intelligentiam tendit; ut per hoc significetur, Filium quoque esse secundum Græcos quidem Causam, secundum Latinos vero Principium, subsistentiæ Spiritûs Sancti sicut et Patrem. Et quoniam omnia quæ Patris sunt Pater ipse Unigenito Filio, suo gignendo dedit præter esse Patrem, hoc ipsum, quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ex Filio, ipse Filius a Patre æternaliter habet a Quo etiam æternaliter genitus est.”—*Definitio Concilii Florentini*.

† “Præpositionem ‘per’ nullâ ratione admittimus; timentes dogma illud ‘per canalem,’ sive ‘per instrumentum’: sed dicimus Spiritum Sanctum procedere ex Patre et Filio ut ab Unico Principio unâ actione.”—Greek Acts, Sess. 25, after Bessarion's oration.

peculiarity as Sole Fount of Deity, nor declares that Father and Son act as One Principle in spirating the Holy Ghost: and in fact the two corresponding misconceptions of Latin doctrine by no means unfrequently arose in the East.

It has occurred to us, that possibly here may be found the reason why successive Pontiffs deprecated the insertion of "Filioque" in the Symbol. The Holy See may well have feared, that this insertion might confirm the Greeks in their inveterate and dangerous misconception of Latin doctrine, and so might precipitate a schism. Still the phrase was in itself most unexceptionable and orthodox, and had constantly indeed been used by Rome herself. And since year after year the habit of thus chanting the Symbol took deeper root in Western habits of devotion, the Holy See might well come at last to judge, that more harm than good would result from further opposition.

All this is of course conjecture on our part, and no part of our argument with Mr. Ffoulkes. But turning now to that gentleman, what is his allegation? It comes to this:—(1) that the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son was never taught as of faith, before the time of Reccared; and (2) that it would never have been taught as of faith at all, except for the pressure put upon the Holy See by lay potentates.

This whole argument proceeds on the strange supposition, that nothing is *taught* by the Church as of faith, which has not been expressly *defined* as of faith. We believe e.g. we are correct in saying, that God's *Omniscience* has never been expressly defined: does our author doubt that that dogma was imposed from the first as of faith? does he think that in any age of the Church it could have been denied without heresy? "The subjection of Divine faith," says Pius IX. in his Munich Brief, "ought not to have been limited to" verities expressly defined; but "extended to those things also, which are delivered as divinely revealed by the ordinary magisterium of the whole Church dispersed through the world." Now Mr. Ffoulkes would be completely unable to prove, that the dogma which we are considering was not imposed as of faith by the Ecclesia Docens throughout the world from the very time of the Apostles. At all events there happens to be a direct demonstration, that it was so imposed long before the time of Reccared. We will not here dwell, as we might, on S. Cyril's well-known 9th anathema, because the words of Pope S. Hormisdas a century later are more full and explicit. That Pontiff speaks of it as *notoriously* a part of the Church's Faith concerning the Blessed Trinity, that "the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son, under one substance of the Deity." His Letter is

written to the Eastern Emperor, and the notoriety mentioned therefore extends over East as well as West. The Holy Pontiff declares that this dogma of the Procession is one of those verities, which *faith has already taught* to the Emperor, which had been *unfailingly asserted*, which were *to be believed until the end*, which were *testified by tradition of the Fathers*, and which should be rootedly fixed in the Christian's heart.\*

---

\* F. Perrone refers to the Letter, "De Trinitate," n. 343. We have thought it better to annex a considerable portion of it, italicizing the words to which we would draw special attention:—

"Neque enim possibile est ut sit diversitas prædicationis, *ubi una est forma veritatis*; nec ab re judicabitur alienum, si cum his, cum quibus conveniemus fide, congruamus dogmate. Revolvantur piis mansuetudinis vestræ auribus decreta synodica, et beati Papæ Leonis convenientia sacræ fidei constituta: eadem invenietis in illis quæ recensueritis in nostris. Quid ergo est post illum fontem fidelium statutorum? quid amplius (*si tamen fidei terminum servat*) quamlibet curiosus scrutator inquirat, aut opere aut institutione perfectius, nisi forte mavult quisquam dubitare quam credere, *certare quam nōsse, sequi dubia quam servare decreta*. Nam si Trinitas Deus, hoc est Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus; Deus autem Unus—specialiter legislatore dicente: 'Audi Israel, Dominus Deus tuus, Deus Unus est,'—qui aliter habet, necesse est aut divinitatem in multa dividat, aut specialiter passionem ipsi essentiæ Trinitatis impingat: et (quod absit a fidelium mentibus) hoc est, aut plures deos more profano gentilitatis inducere, aut sensibilem pœnam ad eam naturam quæ aliena est ab omni passione transferre. Unum est Sancta Trinitas, non multiplicatur numero, non crescit augmento; nec potest aut intelligentiâ comprehendi aut hoc quod Deus est discretionem seungi. Quis ergo illi secreto æternæ impenetrabilisque substantiæ, quod nulla vel invisibilium naturarum potuit investigare natura, profanam derisionem tentet ingerere et divini arcana mysterii revocare ad calculum moris humani? Adoremus Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, indistinctam distincte, incomprehensibilem et innarrabilem, substantiam Trinitatis: ubi etsi admittit numerum ratio Personarum, unitas tamen non admittit essentiæ separationem; ita tamen ut servemus propria natura, servemus propria unicuique Personæ; nec Personis divinitatis singularitas denegetur, nec ad essentiam hoc quod est proprium nominum transferatur. Magnum est sanctæ et incomprehensibile mysterium Trinitatis, Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus Sanctus, Trinitas indivisa: et tamen *notum est* quia proprium est Patris ut generaret Filium; proprium Filii Dei ut ex Patre Patri nasceretur æqualis; *proprium Spiritus Sancti ut de Patre et Filio procederet sub unâ substantiâ deitatis*. Proprium quoque Filii Dei, ut juxta id quod scriptum est; 'In novissimis temporibus verbum caro fieret, et habitaret in nobis': ita intra viscera Sanctæ Mariæ Virginis genetricis Dei unitis utriusque sine aliquâ confusione naturis, ut qui ante tempora erat Filius Dei, fieret filius hominis; . . . Hæc [nec] apud religiosam conscientiam tuam, venerabilis imperator, *tamquam ignota dicuntur*. *Fides enim ipsa*, quæ a te constanter asseritur, tibi reddit hoc muneris, ut sensibus tuis et affectum sui inserat et *scientiam, per quam diligentius asseratur, infundat*. Et tantum interest dispensationis mihi creditæ, ut ego quoque *vel apud scientes nota non taceam*; ut succedente sibi per vices temporum catholicorum prædicatione sensuum *quod indeficienter asseritur sine fine credatur*. Latius hæc, quæ ad deitatem humanitatemque Domini nostri Jesu Christi pertinent et in eo unitas duas sine confusione naturas, potui *secundum veterum definita disserere*, si esset adversum eos qui his dissentiant disputandum:

This Letter was written nearly seventy years before Reccared's conversion, and before "Filioque" was chanted by the Spanish Church in the Symbol; and at that time therefore, the Holy Ghost's Procession from Father and Son was "notoriously" included in the Faith both of West and East. Under the reign of S. Martin I.—after the time of Reccared indeed, but more than a century before that of Charlemagne—the same dogma was so strongly expressed in a Roman synodical Letter to Constantinople, that S. Maximus had to vindicate the Latins against misconception, and to explain that they did not think of denying the Father's peculiarity as Sole Fount of Deity. However there can be no need of adducing further testimonies, except so far as they come directly across Mr. Ffoulkes's path. We will pass on then to S. Leo III.

This holy Pope is one of our author's heroes, because (p. 9) of his having engraved the Symbol in its more ancient form on two shields and hung them up in his church. Mr. Ffoulkes dwells on the fact that S. Leo avowedly did this, "'pro cautela orthodoxæ fidei,' and not merely that the Creed," i.e. the Constantinopolitan Symbol, "might remain intact." If such a statement means anything at all—but very many of the author's statements do *not* mean anything at all—it means that S. Leo III. not only disapproved inserting "Filioque" into the Symbol, but repudiated the corresponding dogma as contrary to "the orthodox Faith." Mr. Ffoulkes then seems to have quite forgotten what he had written *only six lines back*; viz., that S. Leo expressed complete *concurrence* with Charlemagne in *doctrine*. Here is the author's own narrative:—

"'As I understand then,' rejoined one of the Imperial deputies, 'your Paternity orders that the clause in question be first ejected from the Creed [the Symbol], and then afterwards *lawfully learnt and taught by anybody, whether by singing or by oral tradition.*' 'Doubtless that is my desire,' returned Leo, 'and I would persuade you by all means so to act'" (p. 9).

And of the same S. Leo III. Mr. Ffoulkes mentions in a former work,\* that he spoke to all the Eastern Churches

sed cum in manibus omnium fiunt et synodica constituta et beati Papæ Leonis dogmata, *perstrinxisse* potius *pauca*, quam evolvere credidi convenientibus universa. Nunc vero agnoscere satis est et cavere, proprietatem et essentiam cogitandam; ut sciatur quid Personæ, quid nos oporteat deferre Substantiæ: quæ qui indecenter ignorant aut callidâ impietate dissimulant, dum omittunt quid sit proprium Filii, Trinæ tendunt insidias Unitati. Sed si quæ prædicta sunt *validis teneantur fixa radicibus*, nec a paternâ traditione *receditur*, et constanter quæstionibus obviatur."

\* "Christendom's Divisions," Part ii., p. 72.

“of the Holy Ghost as proceeding from the Father and the Son,” and ended with these words: “him that believes not according to this Faith, *the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church condemns.*” Most certainly then, his opposing an insertion of “Filioque” in the Symbol, did not imply ever so remotely an indifference to the indispensable obligation of believing with divine faith the dogma which those words express.

The author however will have it, that S. Leo III.'s immediate predecessor, Adrian I., did *not* believe this dogma. In defence of this assertion he puts forth a statement, of which, had it proceeded from one with whose character we were unacquainted, we should say that it is about the most impudent invention to be found in controversial history. We are quite confident however, that nothing would induce Mr. Ffoulkes to say what he does not think; and moreover it is far easier to understand such a lapse in *his* case, than in that of an abler man. It may be added that such a view was peculiarly attractive to him, as supplying him with a glorious opportunity for sensational writing. We cannot do the thing justice, without a long extract from his pamphlet. It occurs in the course of an imaginary argument, reaching from p. 5 to p. 13, addressed to Archbishop Manning by an imaginary Anglican friend. The inverted commas with which it starts refer to this. The Seventh Œcumenical Council, he says,—

“Met A.D. 787, legislated, and was confirmed by the Pope, who forwarded its decrees, as well as his own approval of them, to Charlemagne. Charlemagne, fired with rancour against the East, immediately set about composing a work to refute them; and when it was ready for publication, summoned a Council at Frankfort of all the bishops of his dominions, at which the decrees of the seventh Council were formally repudiated, and his own work, which he, with the assistance of his theologians, had written against them, approved. This work he forwarded to the Pope, who had confirmed them. One of his principal charges against them was, that the Council enacting them had been silent or ambiguous on a point which he deemed it his duty to prove to the Pope at great length, namely, the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son: in other words, that while it had received a profession of faith from the new Patriarch in which Procession *through* the Son was affirmed, it had said nothing at all on that subject in its own Creed, with which he was therefore dissatisfied, as wanting the addition which had been made to it in Spain by King Reccared.

“What defence the Pope made for S. Tarasius we need not pause to inquire: but this is what he says in reply to the objection urged by the monarch against the Creed.

“ ‘We have already proved the divine dogmas of this Council irreprehensible, as the works of the principal of the holy Fathers abundantly testify.



For should anybody say that he differs from the Creed of the above-named Council, he risks differing (or seems to differ) with the Creed of the six holy Councils: inasmuch as these Fathers spake not of themselves, but according to what had been holily defined and laid down before: as it is written in the book of the sixth holy Council, amongst other things, 'This Creed had been sufficient for the perfect knowledge and confirmation of religion . . . for concerning the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, what it explicitly teaches is perfect' " (pp. 7, 8).

At first reading, it might be thought that Mr. Ffoulkes here purports to quote the Pontiff's ipsissima verba; though such, we soon find, is not his real intention. But he does indisputably mean to say, that he has correctly expressed the general sense of Adrian I.'s reply to Charlemagne, concerning the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son. Our readers cannot be prepared for our declaration—which any one who chooses may verify for himself—that in Adrian's whole reply concerning that dogma, there is not one syllable which by any ingenuity can be distorted into *any mention whatever of the Six Councils*, nor into any even the feeblest support for the sensational paragraph just quoted. How then is our author's hallucination to be explained? Our theory is this. In the section which *immediately follows*,—bearing however on a totally different question,—there is an obvious reference to the Seventh Ephesine Canon, and an express mention of the Six Councils. In our edition, and very possibly therefore in Mr. Ffoulkes's, the same page contains, in its *first* column the conclusion of Adrian's remarks concerning the Procession, and in its *second* his reference to Councils on his new theme. We suggest, that Mr. Ffoulkes's eye glanced accidentally from first to second column; and that, characteristically enough, he blindly read on, without being bright enough to observe the total change of subject.\*

---

\* The section which speaks about the Six Councils was thus occasioned. Charlemagne has inquired "Utrum Theodorus Archiepiscopus Hierosolymorum recte sentiat, qui cum Patrem sine principio penitus et Sempiternum se credere dixit, Filium, nescio sub quâ ambage verborum, non aliud Principium quam Patrem agnoscentem, et ex Ipso subsistentiam habentem, professus sit."

The Pontiff's reply begins as follows. We italicize the sentence which mentions the Six Councils.

"Iste Theodorus patriarcha Hierosolymorum, cum ceteris præcipuis patriarchis, videlicet Cosmâ Alexandriæ, et Theodoro alio Antiochiæ, dudum prædecessori nostro sanctæ recordationis quondam Paulo Papæ miserunt propriam eorum rectæ fidei synodicam: in quâ et de sacratissimis imaginibus subtili narratione, qualiter una cum nostrâ sanctâ Catholicâ et Apostolicâ universali Romanâ ecclesiâ ipsi ceteri orientales orthodoxi episcopi et Christianus populus sentiunt, et in earumdem sanctarum imaginum veneratione sincero mentis affectu ferventes in fide existunt, studuerunt intimandum. Quam synodicam in Latino interpretatam eloquio prædecessor noster quon-



The whole theme of this later section concerns, not the Procession of the Holy Ghost, but the Generation of the Son.

Let us see then what Adrian said in the *earlier* section on the *former* subject. S. Tarasius was Patriarch of Constantinople. At that time the Holy See had not sanctioned any particular form of words, as exclusively to be used for expressing this dogma; and S. Tarasius expressed it, as the Easterns far more commonly did, by saying that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son. On this Charlemagne founds an accusation in these words: "that Tarasius holds incorrect doctrine (*non recte sentiat*), who professes in his exposition of belief, not (according to the Faith of the Nicene Symbol) that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, but that He proceeds from the Father through the Son." The Pontiff in reply takes pains to point out, that there is no real discrepancy in dogma between the Patriarch and the Holy See; and that the former did not *invent* the phrase, but used a phrase familiar to the Fathers: "*Hoc dogma non per se explanavit, sed per doctrinam Sanctorum Patrum confessus est.*" In the course of his exposition, the Pope more than once cites the phrase that the Holy Ghost proceeds *from* the Son, as also patristic and undeniably orthodox. He cites S. Augustine's words that the "Spirit proceeds from the Son;" and argues that the same verity is implied in other parts of that Father's writings. He quotes S. Cyril's ninth anathema. He quotes S. Gregory's express words, that "the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son." And yet Mr. Ffoulkes dares to assert, that this Pontiff denounced all explicit profession of the Holy Ghost's Procession from the Son, as disobedience to the Six First Councils. It needs all our faith in Mr. Ffoulkes's blundering puzzle-headedness, to acquit him (as we sincerely do) of dishonest intention.

On the Procession no more remains to be said. We next turn to our author's errors on the Church's constitution. By

---

dam sanctissimus Dominus Stephanus Papa in suo concilio, quod et ipse pro sacris imaginibus una cum diversis episcopis in partibus Franciæ seu Italiæ fecit, suscipientes ac relegentes, placuerunt tam de diversis Francorum patrum testimoniis, quam de Symbolo fidei ubi facti sunt, dicentes: '*Si quis alium terminum fidei, sive symbolum, aut doctrinam habet, præter quod traditum est a sanctis magnis et universalibus sex synodis, et confirmatum est ab his sanctis patribus qui in eis convenerunt, et non adorat imaginem sive figuram domini nostri Jesu Christi, neque humanationem Ejus confitetur, sicut Qui descendit et incarnatus est propter genus humanum, talem impium anathematizamus et alienum extraneumque deputamus, neque Catholicæ et Apostolicæ ecclesiæ: et cetera quæ longum est enarrari, &c. &c.*'"

far the most remarkable of these, is an opinion, peculiar to Mr. Ffoulkes among all men past, present, and (we are confident) future. Not only (p. 43) he advocates the heretical tenet, that "there are churches, forming part of the Catholic Church, which are and have been for ages out of communion with" the Holy See,—but he adds that this has been for centuries and is still "the formal teaching of the Popes." That such a proposition should be advanced, not as a burlesque but in sober earnest, is an amazing phenomenon indeed. However, we have been warned by many friends that it will not do to pooh-pooh Mr. Ffoulkes; so we will meet his proposition as gravely as he has advanced it.

No verity was ever more universally accepted among Christians from the beginning as a first principle—assumed as a Catholic axiom—embedded in the whole fabric of their convictions—than that the Church's visible unity is by Christ's institution inviolable and indissoluble. Perhaps no writer has so forcibly exhibited the patristic mind on this matter, as Mr. Allies, in his admirable pamphlet called "*Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church*;" and we would beg our readers to study the great mass of patristic testimony, which they will there find brought together. When first then one hears it asserted that Popes have "formally taught" the contradictory of this, one's most keen curiosity is to know, what individual Pope can ever have dropped a phrase open to such wild misconception. The reference must be, one supposes, to something accidentally said in those early centuries, when (through the pressure of persecution) the Church was so dwarfed in stature, so violently repressed from exhibiting her full and legitimate proportions. Mr. Ffoulkes is just the man to seize hold of such a passage, if he came across it in his miscellaneous and desultory reading, and never again let it drop. But not a bit of it. The Popes cited by Mr. Ffoulkes are not those of the early centuries, but of the 13th and 15th; a period at which every one considers the Papacy to have reached a higher development than ever before. Nay Mr. Ffoulkes himself, as we shall presently see, holds that at this time the Popes had been raised by the false Decretals to a position of supremacy, quite unknown to the seven first centuries. And yet he seriously maintains that a certain society, which avowedly paid them no obedience whatever, nor would even hold communion with them, was recognized by them as an integral portion of the Catholic Church: a portion no less integral, than the French, the Spanish, nay the Roman ecclesiastical society herself.

Before examining his individual citations, one remark suggests itself on the surface. The periods to which he refers were

the well-known periods of temporary reconciliation between East and West; two periods which culminated respectively in the second Council of Lyons and the Council of Florence. Now at both these Councils, the Pope's authority in the Church is defined with considerable precision. The former Council approved the Greek Emperor's confession of faith, which had been prescribed to him by two Popes as the condition of reconciliation. That confession thus speaks: we italicize a few words.

*Ipsa quoque Sancta Romana Ecclesia summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam Catholicam obtinet ; quem se ab ipso Domino, in beato Petro Apostolorum principe sive vertice cujus Romanus pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit. Et sicut præ cæteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere : sic et si quæ de fide subortæ fuerint quæstiones, suo debent judicio definiri. Ad quam potest gravatus quilibet super negotiis ad ecclesiasticum forum pertinentibus appellare : et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus, ad ipsius potest judicium recurri : et eidem omnes ecclesiæ sunt subjectæ, ipsarum prælati obedientiam et reverentiam sibi dant. Ad hanc autem sic potestatis plenitudo consistit, quod ecclesias ceteras ad sollicitudinis partem admittit ; quarum multas, et patriarchales præcipue, diversis privilegiis eadem Romana ecclesia honoravit, suâ tamen observatâ prærogativâ, tum in generalibus conciliis tum in aliquibus aliis semper salvâ. (Denz, n. 389).*

The Florentine definition to a similar effect is so well known and has been so often quoted of late, that we need not reprint it. Now to say that the Roman Church (Conc. Lugd.) and the Roman Pontiff (Conc. Floren.) have received from God plenitude of power over the universal Catholic Church,—is simply to say in other words that the Catholic Church was instituted by Christ, as a body politic ruled by the Roman Pontiff. To maintain then that the Eastern separated society was an integral portion of the visible Catholic Church, is to maintain that the Eastern society, while separated from Rome, was an integral portion of the body politic ruled by the Supreme Pontiff. Quod est absurdum. Not only therefore did the Popes of these two periods totally deny Mr. Ffoulkes's doctrine, but the Easterns themselves were peremptorily *required* to deny it, as an indispensable condition of the reunion.

What is it then which has led Mr. Ffoulkes so far astray? Certain expressions used by those very Popes—Clement IV., Gregory X., Eugenius IV.,—who enforced those definitions of Papal supremacy which we have just noticed. It is of course simply impossible, that they can have contradicted the very doctrine which they were enforcing as a condition of communion. On the other hand, at either period the

Eastern Church was apparently animated by a real wish of once more submitting herself to the Vicar of Christ; she was, even in her separated state, the lineal descendant of that illustrious Eastern Church—the inheritor without rival of those august patriarchates—which in earlier days had taken so prominent and so glorious a part in ecclesiastical history; she possessed true sacraments and a true priesthood; she imparted Christ's Body and Blood with real spiritual fruit to those among her people who were invincibly ignorant of the Pope's prerogative, and were otherwise free from mortal sin; she had preserved orthodox doctrine in almost every particular, pure and undefiled. It was simply a Pontiff's duty under such circumstances to address such a society in terms the most cordial, the most deferential, the most affectionate, so far as was consistent with conveying no false impression on the great doctrines of ecclesiastical unity and Papal supremacy.

In order to do Mr. Ffoulkes every justice, we will notice, not merely those expressions of Popes which he cites in his present pamphlet, but those also cited by him in a former volume, to which a note (p. 92) in his present pamphlet refers. It appears therefore, that Clement IV. expressed an earnest desire for “the union of the Latin and Greek Churches,” and condemned “the old and odious quarrel of the Latin and Greek races.” Eugenius IV. said that “the Western and Eastern Church are to come together” at Ferrara; that he has “long and ardently desired their union,” and has “lamented with sorrow and bitterness of heart” their divisions. As to such language as this, we are merely surprised that the author can have taken the trouble to transcribe it and have it printed.

But there is another phrase, cited by him, which undoubtedly requires far more careful attention. Clement IV. “supplicates with many prayers, in all the ardour of sincere affection, that the great Corner-stone, who made His Holy Catholic and universal Church one, would deign to assist it, *rent and divided* with schisms, in mercy *causing it to unite throughout the world* in one orthodox Faith;” and “that He would vouchsafe to *unite His Church* in all the world.” Gregory X. “with bitterness beholds the rent of the universal Church foreshadowed in the net of Peter the fisherman, that brake for the multitude of fishes which it inclosed; we do not say divided as regards its Faith—for which He prayed that it might never fail,—but notoriously and lamentably divided as regards its faithful members;” praying that God “would both *unite His holy Catholic Church* by renewing it, and renew it *by uniting it.*”\*

---

\* The Greek Acts of Florence, as our author points out, represent

And we fully admit that such phrases as these, unless explained by others, are capable of serious misconception. But, as we shall immediately show, they *are* explained by other phrases, and so fixed to their true meaning. In such passages then, as was clearly explained in "Catholic Opinion," by "the Catholic Church" is meant "the assemblage of persons who, by Baptism, once became her children." It is surely by no very unnatural figure of speech, that "the Catholic Church" is spoken of as including, not only her obedient but her rebellious subjects; as including all who have received, through her sacrament, the gift of faith.

Now we say that the very Letters, cited by Mr. Ffoulkes, show this to have been the meaning of either Pontiff. Let it be remembered then, that what we are going to quote is not taken from *other* Pontifical Letters which we cite in *opposition* to Mr. Ffoulkes, but from those identical Letters, to which Mr. Ffoulkes appeals as telling in his *favour*. Firstly, as to Clement IV. The following sentences are taken from the same Letter of his to the Greek Emperor, from which Mr. Ffoulkes has given *other* extracts. We translate from Raynaldus, A.D. 1267, nn. 72-79, and the italics of course are ours. The Emperor had wished that first of all "charity" should be renewed between East and West, and afterwards the question of "faith" should be considered. On our side, replies the Pontiff, there has never been any *breach* of charity.

For God forbid we should confess that the Roman Church, which (having neither spot nor wrinkle) holds that true Faith to-day which she has ever held, visits with hate *her children* even *when they turn from her*: since, beyond doubt, *the same mother Church* showing an affection of pious love to just men *and sinners*, to obedient *and rebellious*, aims at the salvation of all in every way she can. Nor on that account should she be accounted to love the less, because sometimes (where justice requires) she breaks down the strength of *sinner*s who despise *obedience* to her salutary admonitions. Just as in a right view, no physician should be called hateful who uses knife and cautery for those wounds which are not cured by milder medicines. . . .

By the tenour of these presents we have thought fit to declare what is *necessary to be done* (*faciendum incumbat*) by the prelates and others living under your authority, in order that you may *return with due reverence* (*reverenter redeas*) *into the bosom* of the same Holy Roman Church *your mother*.

---

Eugenius IV. as on one single occasion using a similar phrase. But in our article on the Council of Florence (April, 1866, pp. 530-532) we argued that there is no ground whatever for ascribing it to him. If he did use it—which we entirely disbelieve—his words can, of course, be explained on the same principle with those of Clement IV. and Gregory X.

And then the Pontiff proceeds to impose, as an indispensable condition for reunion, an acceptance of that confession of faith, which expresses the very stringent doctrine on Papal supremacy already placed before our readers.

Clement IV., then, was very far indeed from treating the Eastern schismatics, as though they belonged to an independent branch of the Universal Church, with which he was negotiating an alliance. On the contrary, he describes them as *children* of the Roman Church, but *rebellious* children. He declares to them authoritatively what firm faith they must profess in his supreme authority and its divine institution, if they would be reunited. He speaks of them as now indeed *external* to "the bosom of the Holy Roman Church," but as piously intending "to return with due reverence into that bosom."

In precisely a similar tone speaks Gregory X. Raynaldus, A.D. 1272, nn. 25-29.

Our predecessor Clement IV. [drew out the confession of faith which] he required you, your clerics, and your people to acknowledge, if you would *return into the unity of the Church* according to his wish.

If, after you your clergy and people had *returned* into the *obedience* of the same Roman Church, you should ask for a Council to be called at some place which *the same Roman Church should judge expedient*, he openly enough gave you hope that he would *comply with your wish* in this respect.

Therefore we *admonish*, beseech, and exhort your majesty (*magnificentiam tuam*) in Jesus Christ . . . . that you would *return into the Lord's fold* and by His favour bring back also your clerics and people.

Gregory X. then, as Clement IV. before him, admonished the Emperor to cease from spiritual rebellion, to *return* into *the Lord's fold*, and to bring back with him his clergy and people. He explains "the unity of the Church" as meaning "obedience to the Roman Church."

Observe, these are the two principal Letters on which Mr. Ffoulkes relies, as showing that the Holy See has recognized, for portions of the Visible Church, societies external to its own communion. In the case of an ordinary writer, we should complain severely of the sharp practice here exhibited; we should complain severely of his quoting part of these Letters, and yet suppressing those very characteristic portions which we have given. What might be said e.g., on his citing Gregory X. to the effect that the Easterns were already members of the Catholic Church, when on the contrary that Pontiff was "admonishing" them, to "*return to the Lord's fold*"? Is any portion then of the visible Catholic Church external to "the Lord's fold"? But we can quite fancy such a thinker



as Mr. Ffoulkes not to have *observed*, that these expressions are in direct contradiction to his theory.

We have already pointed out that the confession of faith, enforced by Clement IV. and Gregory X. on the East, is utterly inconsistent with that theory which Mr. Ffoulkes is bent on ascribing to them. We have now further shown, that those very Letters of theirs, which he cites as containing that theory, on the contrary contradict it, in terms than which none plainer can easily be imagined.

We pass lastly to the author's contention (p. 27), that the Supreme Pontiff exercises greater authority in the Church than belongs to him by divine right; and that he has been greatly assisted in that assumption by the False Decretals. In this part of his argument, he does but follow the track of abler men, and has less scope therefore for his own characteristic twists; but his position is to the full as untenable as in the other parts of his pamphlet. His argument runs thus, though we give it in our own words:—"Putting  
"aside the False Decretals, there is no solid historical ground  
"for the Ultramontane theory. Successive Popes however,  
"in promotion of their aggressive and encroaching purposes,  
"gladly made use of these Decretals without examining their  
"genuineness; and having once put forth their exorbitant  
"claims, do not now choose to draw back." We join issue directly with the first of these propositions. We maintain that facts of the first seven centuries, before these Decretals were heard of, are amply sufficient to establish irrefragably what Mr. Ffoulkes calls the Ultramontane theory. Nor need we add, that if the author's first proposition is overthrown, the whole reasoning thereon based collapses.

The present question concerns the Pope's authority, not in *teaching*, but in *governing*. The "Ultramontane theory" on this head may be expressed in three theses. 1. Christ has appointed the Roman Bishop to be the Church's supreme ruler on earth: in such sense, that no man or assemblage of men has any power whatever to resist or in any way to limit his authority; and in such sense also, that all spiritual jurisdiction is derived from him as from its ultimate earthly source.\* 2. Yet the Pope's supremacy—though thus "ecclesiastically absolute" as we have often called it—is by no means absolute in every sense. It is limited, not only (as of course) by the natural

---

\* In this brief sketch, it is of course not worth while to touch such questions as the state of things when the Holy See is vacant; or, again, when there is no *certain* Pope.

law, but in many particulars by the divine positive law. The Pope has no power e.g. to abolish the Episcopate, &c. &c. 3. It is infallibly provided however by God, that the Pontiff will never claim any authority which he does not possess; and the duty of Catholics therefore, is simply to obey without question every law which he enacts. It need hardly be added, that he has no less absolute authority to repeal laws than to enact them; and that no disciplinary canon, whether of Ephesus or any other Council, is of more value than the paper on which it is written, except so far as it still enjoys the Pontifical sanction and confirmation.\*

Now of the three above recited theses, it is only the first which need here concern us; for no one who admits it will make any difficulty about the two others. We are to argue then, from the facts of the first seven centuries, that this thesis is indubitably true.

We assume, as the foundation of our argument, that the Church possesses by divine appointment what we have often called "hierarchical unity"; that Christ founded her as one society under one supreme government. In January, 1867, we drew out after our own fashion, in reply to Dr. Pusey, the arguments adduced on this head by Catholic theologians: nor is there anything in Mr. Ffoulkes's pamphlet which affects the argument there exhibited, except those very inept citations from Clement IV. and Gregory X. which we have already exposed. This doctrine then being assumed, the next inquiry must be—What is that supreme government? in the hands of what man, or of what ecclesiastical body, has that government been vested by God? Our own answer is, simply in the hands of *S. Peter and of his successors to the end of time*. The proofs of this doctrine ordinarily adduced by Catholic controversialists are all, as we believe, of extreme cogency. We will here briefly recount them, reserving to the last that one which we account simply irrefragable.

We cannot be expected of course to transcribe here page after page, of what is found in authoritative volumes: we can only give a summary of what they say, and that with a particular view to Mr. Ffoulkes's objections. And it should be borne in mind at starting, that this is a question on which every Pope from the beginning must have formed an explicit judgment one way or the other. It was simply the most practical question in the world to any Pope,—so far as regarded his ecclesiastical measures,—whether he was, on one hand, the

---

\* See Murray de Ecclesiâ, d. 20, n. 76, for a full explanation of this statement; which is not necessary for our present purpose.

Church's ecclesiastically supreme ruler; or whether, on the other hand, he and other individual bishops were alike subject to some supreme authority placed over them on earth. The whole course of every Pope's every ecclesiastical movement, from first to last, must have depended vitally on the view taken by him concerning this most fundamental question.

1. Catholic theologians point out a vast number of Pontifical dicta, expressing with the greatest imaginable clearness that in the Holy See is vested the Church's supreme government. "An ordinary acquaintance with the authentic Letters of the early Popes," says F. Bottalla, "might at least have taught" a Protestant "that the venerable Pontiffs *conceived themselves* to be, *jure divino*, heads of the Church."\* F. Bottalla appeals continuously to the whole series of their extant Letters, from the very beginning. One early Pope says that he "has been entrusted with the care of all the churches"; another that such was the Holy See's authority, that none might venture to question its judgment; a third that his relation to the other bishops was that of head to members; &c. &c.

2. On the other hand, no Gallican or Anglican has been able to adduce one instance, in which a Pope has so much as hinted at the existence of any ecclesiastical authority on earth superior to his own: in which, e. g., he has so much as hinted that he is in any way whatever subject to a *Council*, however large.†

3. Theologians also adduce a large and consistently sustained course of practical action, exhibiting the confidence with which Popes claimed plenitude of authority, over the whole Church and over every portion of it.

So much then cannot be denied by the most sceptical; and it is of extreme moment. The whole body of Popes from the beginning have firmly held, as an Apostolic tradition, that supreme authority over the Church has been vested by Christ in the Holy See, and in no other earthly authority.

4. Theologians further point out, that the claims of Rome have been received with acquiescence and submission by all other churches, both in East and West. F. Bottalla, in his fourth section, draws out a long chain of instances, reaching from Nicæa to the very times of Photius, in which even Easterns have most fully admitted the Roman supremacy. The Chalcedonian Fathers declared, e. g. in so many words, that Pope S. Leo is "*the very person* entrusted by the Saviour

\* "Supreme Authority of the Pope," p. 63.

† As to S. Leo I.'s language concerning the disciplinary canons of Nicæa, see Murray de Ecclesiâ, d. 20, nn. 70-73. See also n. 76.

with the guardianship of the vineyard."\* But to say this, is ipso facto to deny that there is any *other* authority, entrusted by Christ with the guardianship of His vineyard, to which the Pope is subject.

To this fourth argument an objection has constantly been raised, from such instances of resistance as that of S. Cyprian; S. Hilary of Arles; S. Augustine and the African bishops in the case of Apianus. Now as to these cases, the facts themselves have been inconceivably exaggerated and distorted; but on this we need not here insist. Taking them at their strongest, we reply that facts cannot be accounted objections to a theory, if they may be explained by assuming the *truth* of that theory. And these facts have again and again been so explained: especially by Mr. Allies in that admirable work, "*Dr. Pusey and the Ancient Church*," to which we have already referred. The explanation, briefly put, is as follows. According to "the Ultramontane theory," there is a divine promise that Apostolic tradition shall ever be preserved pure and undefiled in the local church of Rome; but there is no such promise as regards other churches. In the earliest age, from obvious circumstances, Pontiffs could only exercise a very small portion of that authority which they had received from God; and the result of this may quite imaginably have been, that the true doctrine on their supremacy was held with less completeness, vividness, and consistence, in various portions of the Church. In proportion as circumstances permitted, it became the duty of Popes (if we may use Mr. Allies's happy expression) to "unify" the Church, by a larger exercise of power than had hitherto been practicable. It may have happened therefore by no means unnaturally, that now and then some bishop, whose liberty of action was thus circumscribed and who did not clearly and distinctly apprehend (as Popes always apprehended) the full bearing of Catholic doctrine on the subject, protested against such exercises of power as encroachments. Such protests, if they really were made, cannot be considered objections to the "Ultramontane theory;"

---

\* Protestants try to neutralize the force of this expression, by referring to the 28th canon of Chalcedon. But the history of that canon, as F. Bottalla shows, confirms most strongly (instead of weakening) the Papal claim. See our number for October, 1868, p. 435. The Chalcedonian Fathers admitted throughout that the canon would have no validity without S. Leo's sanction; they urgently entreated him therefore to confirm it, and so "comfort our pious kings, who *firmly hold your Holiness's judgment as law*;" and when he summarily annulled it "through the authority of Blessed Peter the Apostle," all professed submission: no one protest being <sup>had</sup> exceeded his prerogative.

because, as has now been seen, they admit of an easy explanation assuming the *truth* of that theory.

5. We now come lastly to the most irrefragable of all those arguments on which theologians lay stress. Christ placed the Church under some supreme government or other: this we have assumed as the foundation of our argument. If that supreme government then be not the Holy See, it is some other. *Let that other be named.* Will it be said, e. g., that He placed her under a senate of *Patriarchs* as under a governing body? that the Pope himself is subject to that senate, deciding by a majority of its members? or was the senate of *Primates* her governing body? No one has ever dreamed of such absurdities. Yet it is surely not asking too much of opponents, if we call on them at least to state the *thesis* for which they contend.

It will be said perhaps, that the Church's government appertains to the Episcopate *acting in union* with the Pope. This is undoubtedly sound doctrine; but it is only the "Ultramontane theory" differently stated. If those bishops only—be they more or fewer—constitute part of the Church's government, who are acting in union with the Holy See;—it obviously follows, that the supreme power ultimately resides in the Holy See itself.

In fact, there is only one alternative which Gallicans can gravely advocate; and that is the theory asserted and put into practice at Basle. According to that theory, the body of bishops (deciding by a majority) is supreme over all archbishops, primates, patriarchs, and over the Pope himself. This is doubtless not only a straightforward and intelligible theory, but one which was been actually maintained. We have now therefore to ask Mr. Ffoulkes whether he will even allege, that there was a single ecclesiastic of the first seven centuries who so much as dreamed of it. Why it would have sounded as monstrous in the ears of Anatolius or Dioscurus as of S. Leo himself. It was never heard of in the Church, before the great schism and the period of uncertain Popes; and it cannot possibly therefore be an Apostolic tradition. The Ultramontane theory introduced by the False Decretals! Why the only theory, which has been devised *in opposition* to Ultramontanism, was started at a time when every one believed the *genuineness* of those Decretals.

Mr. Ffoulkes (pp. 26, 66) says that "the Church of Rome" "claims to be the executive of the whole Church." When did she ever put forth such a claim? Her claim is to possess *supreme authority* over the whole Church. See e. g. the confession of faith, already quoted, required by successive Popes

of the Greek Emperor. Again (p. 27 et alibi), he alleges that there is a certain disciplinary "code of the Universal Church," which the Pope has no divinely-given power to touch. This is merely to say in other words, that the Pope is not the Church's supreme ruler on earth; but that her supreme government on earth is vested in some other man or body of men. Let him *name* then that man or body of men; and let him adduce Scriptural and traditional evidence for his proposition. Of course he has not made the feeblest attempt to do anything of the kind. We only wish he would.

Never has the Holy See been permitted by circumstances, to exercise the plenitude of that jurisdiction with which Christ invested it. Now the Church's unity, consolidation, and consequent welfare, are more effectually promoted, in proportion as Christ's institution can be more completely realized; and successive Pontiffs, who have felt this by a more or less unconscious instinct, have acted accordingly. In the fourth century they exercised greater authority than in ante-Nicene times; in the sixth greater than in the fourth; in the eighth than in the sixth. At a time when this movement was rapidly proceeding, the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals appeared. We are not here to attempt any critical comments on these Decretals,—a task which would require an article to itself. We have nowhere ourselves happened to see so clear and full account of them in a short space, as in Hefele's contribution on the subject to Göschler's theological dictionary;\* and to that we refer for the few facts which it will be necessary to mention. But our only concern with them here, is their bearing on Mr. Ffoulkes's argument.

He coolly throws off (p. 27) by saying that, "to the best of his belief," "*no certain proof* has been found" "of their having been manufactured at Rome, or by order of Rome." This is too much even for his encomiast in the "Saturday Review"; who points out as an indubitable historical fact, that the Roman See had no more to do with their manufacture than had Mr. Ffoulkes himself. That gentleman however proceeds to allege, that "she must have known from the first, or been able to ascertain, whether they came from her archives or not; yet she studiously forbore from inquiring, and said nothing." How in the world *was* she to know? In one point the author is undoubtedly consistent. He is bent on giving every historical event that colour, which shall make it most antagonistic to Rome. Our readers may remember, that

---

\* We quote from the French translation: article "Pseudo-Isidore."  
VOL. XII.—NO. XXIV. [*New Series.*] X



three years ago he made some amazing remarks on the Florentine Definition. He distorted indeed, in that wonderful way which is peculiar to himself, the Greek original of that Definition (see our number for April, 1866, pp. 550-2); but the *Latin* original defied even *his* manipulation. Accordingly he got up a theory, that the Latin original had been lost immediately after the Council; and that the existing Latin is a translation made from the Greek 150 years later. He had *then* no difficulty in supposing, that the infallible decree of an Ecumenical Council may have been irretrievably lost. But now he holds, that Pontiffs of the ninth and subsequent centuries could know, by consulting their "archives," whether a certain Letter were genuine, which purported to have been written by some Pope, e.g. in the days of persecution. We again ask *how* were they to know this? Some given Pope sees an epistle, purporting to come from one of his predecessors, indicating that in some early century the Holy See exercised that power which, as the said Pontiff knows, it indubitably *possesses*. What was there to awaken his suspicion? Why was he not to believe, what in that uncritical age all the world believed? It has been thought by some, that the Decretals unduly depress the Episcopate; and that their unorthodoxy therefore should have made a Pope see their spuriousness. But Hefele points out (p. 360), that their tendency was rather to exalt than depress men's notions of the episcopal office. S. Anacletus, e.g., is represented as saying that the other Apostles had "honour and power in equal fellowship with Peter;" and S. Evaristus, that the bishops are "ambassadors of God, and vicegerents of Christ."

To what then do the author's accusations amount? What did any given Pope do, which all honest men would not have done in his place? It was greatly important for the Church's welfare—and so he knew—that he should exercise as much of his divinely-given power as circumstances would permit. He was fully persuaded, through these Decretals, that certain of his predecessors in early ages had done the very thing which he now claimed to do; and he also saw the very obvious fact that, by drawing attention to this precedent, he should make this exercise of authority far less unpalatable. Men were tempted to disobey the just command of a divinely-appointed ruler—that is, they were tempted to a sinful act. By drawing attention to this supposed precedent, he much lessened their temptation; nor had he the slightest doubt that this precedent really existed. Where is the ground here for blame?

The question is wholly irrelevant to our purpose, whether

the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals did, or did not, importantly accelerate a more extensive exercise of Pontifical authority. For ourselves, we are disposed to agree with Hefele that they did *not* accelerate this in any great degree. He shows (pp. 368-9) that they did nothing more than express and formulize existing habits and views; and he exhibits in detail, that they hardly contain one ecclesiastical rule, which had not already been laid down before their appearance. What few novelties they do contain, he adds, never passed into practice. But let us suppose, for argument's sake, that the case had been altogether otherwise—that they had given indefinite furtherance to the practical development of the Holy See's power. What then? The only relevant question is, whether that power were divinely given; and we have already shown that it was. Mr. Ffoulkes (p. 38) apparently holds, that no real benefit can by possibility be derived from a thing in itself sinful. Does God then never draw good out of evil? Does Mr. Ffoulkes consider Judas's betrayal of Christ to have been a virtuous action? Or does he think, on the other hand, that God did not make use of that betrayal for the benefit of mankind?

We have now, we believe, gone through all the doctrinal points of this pamphlet.\* No room is left us for considering its various historical statements; which indeed occupy a much more subordinate place in this, than in the author's previous works.† But what may be expected as to the character of these statements? In theological and argumentative documents, such as those with which we have hitherto been so largely occupied, much protection is afforded against individual eccentricities, by the necessity of preserving logical consistency in their interpretation; of making each sentence harmonize with the general context and bearing of the argument. In history, private judgment has far wider latitude. If then on the former class of subjects our author falls into such incredible misconceptions as the reader has seen, it may be imagined what a sensational romance he will write under the name of history.‡

---

\* Unless indeed we refer to the remark in p. 39, that when S. Peter said to our Lord "Be that far from Thee, O Lord, this shall not be to Thee" (Matt. xvi. 22), he was already Pope, and was teaching the Church *ex cathedra*. From this Mr. Ffoulkes infers, that S. Peter's mistaken prophecy disproves the doctrine of Papal infallibility.

† Mr. Ffoulkes's volumes on "Christendom's Divisions" were criticised in our numbers of April and July, 1867.

‡ In p. 21 we find a statement which, at first reading, makes one distrust one's eyes. Eugenius IV. was "the only Pope who ever presided over a

And now to conclude. Here is a writer, we will not merely say who can hardly carry on one step of reasoning

---

General Council in person." Why, out of the eighteen Œcumenical Councils, exactly one-half have been presided over by the Pope in person. But we suppose on reflection that, since the Photian schism, Mr. Ffoulkes would account no Council "general," which did not contain a muster of Photians in force : so that even the Council of Trent does not fall under the category. In the same page he represents, if we rightly understand him, that the Pope threatened the Emperor with imprisonment in Florence till the latter should agree to the union ; and adds that his " blood curdles " from merely " transcribing " the Pope's language. So distressing a physical affection must have prevented him from understanding words, which are as simple and obvious as possible. We have described the scene to which he refers, in our article on the Council of Florence (April, 1866, p. 515).

The same perverse mistiness characterizes Mr. Ffoulkes on matters of fact. We will give two instances which have been already exposed in the " Weekly Register." In p. 52 he says that the only zealous priest at Seville, when he was there, was " a young priest who had served his time at the Brompton Oratory." And he adds the preposterous remark, that " the Brompton Oratory, that heart-stirring creation of *old Oxford and Cambridge men*, had sent out missionaries to evangelize Seville." It turns out (see " Weekly Register " for Jan. 30, p. 73) that the priest here referred to (whose mother was a Spaniard, his father being English) belonged to the *Seville Oratory* ; that he never belonged to any other religious community whatever ; and that he never received any instruction from, nor had any kind of connection with, either of the two English Oratories. Mr. Ffoulkes not only has not apologized for this misrepresentation, but denies that any apology is due. See his letter in the " Weekly Register " of Feb. 20.

The second instance is much more serious than the first ; and occurs in close juxtaposition with it. He deposes, that the priest of a certain small Spanish village had " the honours of his house always done by one who *went by the name of* his ' cugina ' ; but I was laughed at for *supposing it meant* the relationship that we understand by it." It turns out, that there is no such word in the Spanish language as " cugina " ; the only words at all similar being " *cocina* " a " kitchen," and " *cocinera* " a " cook." Signor Guibara, the Spanish gentleman who has drawn attention to this (see " Weekly Register " of Feb. 20, p. 121) adds that " in Spain it is the custom in many parts for the servants to eat at table with their masters." Mr. Ffoulkes in reply declares he " never dreamt of the word ' cugina ' being a Spanish word " ; but that the word was used to *him*, as to one not knowing Spanish. Now what he had *said* was, that this female " *went by the name of* " the priest's " cugina " ; not that she had been so called to *himself*.

Further, Mr. Ffoulkes point blank refuses Signor Guibara's most reasonable request " to give him the means of identifying this scandalous priest." He will not, forsooth, " turn informer." He has no scruple in bringing the foulest charge against the whole priesthood of a country : for in his pamphlet he says that the respect paid to this priest proves " such things " to be " not uncommon " in Spain. He adduces this charge so lightly, that he is content to base it on a statement of facts, which on his own showing is grievously inaccurate. But when he is asked by an indignant Spanish gentleman to supply means for testing the truth of his most odious accusation, he replies that " not for a moment " will he entertain such a thought. How could such conduct be duly characterized, if he were a person really competent—as most other educated men are competent—to understand the meaning of his own words and acts ?

without a fallacy, but who can hardly read a theological document without understanding it to mean just the reverse of what it says; who cannot even be trusted for not mixing up two totally heterogeneous treatises into one monstrous imaginary compound (see pp. 289-90); and who has not so much as that amount of intelligence, which would enable him to see his own intellectual disqualifications. Confident in his powers, he sets himself to study theology and ecclesiastical history, and to criticise with perfect freedom each one of the three societies which he regards as jointly constituting the Catholic Church. He arrives at a conclusion, the like of which has never before been imagined by Catholic, Photian, or Anglican; and, having arrived at it, he proposes it, not as a theory on trial, but as the one indubitable truth. So indubitable indeed, that, strong in its confident assumption, he does not hesitate to charge the whole series of Popes (of those whom he himself considers to occupy a higher place in the Church than any other individuals whomsoever) with the heaviest offences against both truth and peace. "Rome has abundantly proved during *the last thousand years* that she can be a most negligent, hesitating, fickle, self-seeking, hypocritical guide" (p. 20). She "rose" to her "eminence . . . most unrighteously . . . by fraud and force" (p. 27); the schisms of Christendom have been caused by "the flagrant unfaithfulness and injustice of her governmental policy, both as regards doctrine and discipline" (p. 37); she has exhibited qualities the reverse of "honesty, justice, truthfulness, meekness, and self-denial" (p. 39); the Popes "countenanced" iniquity, "because it brought gain and aggrandisement to themselves and their See" (p. 62).

And what is this wonderful theory of his, which leads him to such complacent utterance of these wild reproaches? When was there a parallel to it in its monstrous extravagance? It was infallibly decided in the fifth century, says the author, that no further definition of faith would ever be lawful; and an irreversible disciplinary law was enacted, visiting clerical offenders against the above declaration with deposition, and lay offenders with anathematization. At the very next Ecumenical Council, the whole Church offended against this declaration and incurred this penalty, by adopting further definitions of faith; nor have either Catholics, Photians, or Anglicans ever receded from these further definitions. He does not explain whether offending clerics do or do not incur anathematization *as well as* deposition (see pp. 274-7 of our article); and we will therefore take the two alternatives successively. According to the latter alternative, he considers that for more than a

thousand years the Church has consisted, merely of a deposed Pope (who is of course no Pope at all) and of a large number of deposed clerics; all laymen having ceased to be her members by anathematization. If he takes the former alternative, he holds that for more than a thousand years there has been no Catholic Church anywhere; but in her place a vast number of anathematized clerics and laymen. Yet he calls Rome at this moment "the executive of the Church."\* In other words a deposed Pope, who is therefore no Pope at all, is the executive of a society, which probably does not exist; but from which, anyhow, all laymen are excluded. And he tells the world (p. 46) that he "frequents regularly and prizes exceedingly" the sacraments administered by deposed priests to anathematized laymen:—sacraments which, if he understood ever so distantly what he has himself been saying, he could not approach without mortal sin.

There have doubtless been other non-Catholics who have less respect for authority than Mr. Ffoulkes; and there may possibly (though we doubt the fact) have been Catholic writers equally puzzle-headed: but the former of these classes has been saved by its common sense, and the latter by its loyalty to the Church, from such a mass of confused bewilderment. Who is there, who has there ever been, uniting, as Mr. Ffoulkes unites them, the total absence of ability with the total absence of self-mistrust?

Mr. Ffoulkes is somewhat fond of autobiography: of exhibiting to his readers the candour, the love of research, the largeness of sympathy, which he considers himself to possess. We shall not therefore be travelling out of the record, if we make some comment on his various exhibitions of personal character. With several of these we have much sympathy. We enumerated in our last number (p. 257) his singular and most honourable freedom from all bitterness and all imputation of unworthy motives. His whole career has displayed unselfish zeal and public spirit, though in the pursuit of most anti-Catholic ends; and it is really touching to find a writer who so heartily admires and respects piety, as far as his narrow spiritual vision enables him to apprehend it. We have never indeed been even tempted to one harsh or unkind thought of him. As to his intellectual defects, we are the last to think that any amount of these should diminish

---

\* Christendom "is only disunited de facto, because" certain laws "are infringed, and *the executive of the Church* is indifferent, or else a party to their infringement. If Rome is really the executive of the Church, &c." (p. 66).

one's feeling of respect towards any human being; and his very unconsciousness of them may rank merely as one intellectual defect the more. But we must maintain that there is one very unhappy side to his character, and we will briefly explain our meaning.

Every rational human being is possessed, consciously or unconsciously, by a certain theoretical rule of life; by a certain assemblage of principles, as to what he should believe and what he should do. Now though indubitably a man has power, without any instruction, of arriving at a clear and certain knowledge of various elementary verities, he cannot so arrive at a whole substantially true doctrinal and moral code; while even as to the verities which *are* within his reach, it is immeasurably more *probable* that he will attain them by help of instruction than without that help. God, by His providential dispensation of things, has taken care that this shall be impressed on the mind of all; for He has placed all men under the necessity of first learning their rule of life from parents or other teachers. In the normal state of things, from an early period the voice of parents is greatly superseded or supplemented by the Church's infallible teaching, and so a healthy growth ensues. On the other hand those who unhappily have been trained outside the Church, in proportion as they emerge from the shelter of parental training, are ever looking out (if they are well advised) for some authority higher and better than themselves, from which they may derive fresh and increasing light. Even Mr. Carlyle can see that "true guidance, in return for loving obedience, is the prime want of man." While by way of contrast, if you would have an instance of one whose prospects of acquiring truth are almost hopeless, contemplate the man, who makes himself the one centre and standard of his own views; who summons all other men and things before the tribunal of his own private judgment; who does not aim earnestly and energetically at enlarging and elevating his moral perception, but, on the contrary, only values that of others so far as it agrees with his own.

Such a man, emphatically, is Mr. Ffoulkes. We do not presume to conjecture how far he is responsible for his present moral malformation; but we cannot doubt that this malformation lies at the root of his errors. What would he say to a child of ten years old, who should set himself to estimate candidly the character of his parents, to balance their excellences and defects, and to judge on the respective merits of his father and his mother? Yet such a child would be a model of humility in comparison with Mr. Ffoulkes. He has never



rightly been a Catholic at all. He joined the Church's visible communion, not because he acknowledged her claim to be his one trustworthy and his infallible guide to sanctification and salvation, but (p. 3) in order that he might "*judge* of her system fairly and adequately." He did not come to learn, but to judge. He "*studied her worship in town and country*" (*ib.*), not for the sake of obtaining a clearer and fuller apprehension of the truths committed to her keeping, but that he might "*compare that worship with what he had abandoned for it at home.*" "*All this has been my constant employment,*" he says, "*for the last dozen years or more.*" "*I have been engaged constantly, ever since I joined the Roman communion, in instituting comparisons between members of the Church of England and members of the Church of Rome : . . . or between Christianity in England and Christianity on the Continent*" (p. 47). Poor man! we do not doubt it at all. The blindness to all high and heroic piety, to everything which can be called saintliness,—so conspicuous in all he writes,—here receives its full explanation. He has never subjected his intellect to authority, and you may see the result. He sees no spiritual superiority in the Church of Christ over the Anglican denomination,\* as the blind man sees no difference of illumination between midday and midnight. He declares by his motto that there is a "beam" in the eye of the Roman Church, and a "mote" in that of other religious societies: it is *his own* spiritual vision alone, to which he trusts as clear and undimmed.

We do not know if he will be disposed to accept advice at our hands, in the spirit in which it is offered. But we would entreat him to put aside his theological speculations for a given period, say two years; and meanwhile to occupy himself from time to time in spiritual exercises, under the guidance of some experienced and sagacious director, who will know what particular verities to press on his attention. We should be much surprised if, on emerging from such a course of discipline, he regarded his present self with any other feelings, than those of bitter repentance, indignation, and contempt.

---

\* His argument, by the way, from p. 45 to 52 (as has been excellently pointed out in "*Catholic Opinion*"), either proves that Presbyterians, Wesleyans, &c., have a true Eucharist, or that they have no true piety.

Since the above note was in type, this particular point—and also the difference almost of *kind* between Catholic and non-Catholic piety—have been admirably treated in the March issue of the "*Month*."

## ART. II.—F. NEWMAN'S OXFORD PAROCHIAL SERMONS.

*Parochial and Plain Sermons.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D., formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. In 8 vols., new edition. Rivingtons : London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1868.

THIS publication is, we believe, wholly without precedent. Protestant sermons as such are about the most ephemeral of printed books. We do not mean to class them with "light literature," as in most cases they have small claims to either part of the title. Yet few, very few out of the acres of sermons printed year by year, have established a name anything like as lasting even as that of a successful novelist. South, Barrow, Tillotson, and Jeremy Taylor, so far as we remember, are the only English writers whose sermons in numerous volumes have attained something of a permanent sale. And we much doubt whether any woman now living has read two sermons of Tillotson's. Among the last men who read one of them, we take to have been the elegant and amiable Reginald Heber, who sums up their characteristics, as "dull good sense." South we suppose is more read, although less than he deserves. But it is as a wit rather than a preacher. Barrow has left under the title of sermons, learned essays more quoted than read. Even where a single volume has survived the "age of man," it has chiefly been such as Butler's, for which the illustrious author apologizes as unfit either to be preached or "published under the title of sermons." These are exceptional cases. We very much doubt whether there is any one instance of an English Protestant preacher, whose *bonâ fide* sermons, after having had a large sale when published in separate volumes, have been so much called for thirty years later as to reappear in eight volumes. Yet even this, we need hardly say, is not the real peculiarity of the present publication. What is wholly without example is, that such a demand should exist among English Protestants for the sermons preached in a Protestant pulpit, by one whom the present generation has known only as a Catholic priest. This single fact, every man must admit, marks a change in the public feeling, whether he believes it to be for good or for evil, such as would have been deemed utterly impossible when these sermons were first published.

Very few, we imagine, of the purchasers of the new edition were to be found among those who in those days hung upon the lips of the Vicar of S. Mary's; for of those who still survive, most have copies of the original editions, endeared to them, not merely by their intrinsic value, but by many recollections of youthful days. Perhaps to most readers a few words about the time and place and circumstances of the original delivery of these sermons, may do more to assist them in realizing what they were, than any portrait of an author at the beginning of his works.

"Time speeds its restless course," and surely it is not merely the deception of nearness that makes us feel that serious changes were never more rapid than they have been in the last forty years. If an intelligent Oxford man had fallen asleep in, say 1828, and could awake now, the surprise of the seven sleepers could hardly have been greater than his. It was in February, 1828, that the Rev. J. H. Newman was presented by his college to the Vicarage of S. Mary the Virgin in Oxford, vacant by the election of the late Vicar to the Provostship of Oriel College, which he still holds. All men have noticed how strangely details, small in themselves, sometimes impress themselves upon the most treacherous memory, which suffers words and events of real moment to glide through it and sink into the ground. Such is the freshness with which the writer of these lines remembers the scene in that church, when the new Vicar, just seven-and-twenty years of age, "read in," as the ceremony is called, by which the law requires that every newly appointed incumbent should declare his adherence to the Established Church. How little did any then present anticipate the events which were, so to say, to cluster around his tenure of that office, momentous not only to himself or the parishioners committed to his care, but to thousands to whom, at the time, his very name was unknown. As yet, indeed, he was as little known beyond the immediate circle of his own college as any man of his age, and who had attained that position, could well be. It was the moment of sunrise, and only very close observers could yet forecast what sort of day was coming. Speaking of the time from 1823 to 1826, he has said:—

To no one at Oxford at this time did I open my heart fully and familiarly. But things changed in 1826. At that time I became one of the tutors of my College, and this gave me position; besides, I had written one or two essays which had been well received. I began to be known. I preached my first University sermon. Next year I was one of the Public Examiners for the B.A. degree. In 1828 I became Vicar of St. Mary's. It was to me like the feeling of spring weather after winter; and, if I may so speak, I came out of my shell; I remained out of it till 1841.\*

---

\* "History of my Religious Opinions," p. 16.

Who could bear to think of the immense interests so often affected by events trifling in themselves, if he did not believe that

There's a Divinity which shapes our ends,  
Rough hew them how we may ;

and that the course of this world is truly ordered, to effect His own purposes, by Him who is Love as well as Wisdom and Power. Sir John Taylor Coleridge, in his "Memoir of the Rev. John Keble," speaks of his own disappointment at the time in not seeing Mr. Keble elected to the Provostship as one of those "which one comes to regard as special blessings." This is because, although "within his college, as the father, friend, and pastor, in some sense, of his fellows and students, no one could have excelled Keble," his situation with regard to the troubles which soon began to agitate the University would have been painful to his sensitive nature. We may add, that if Keble had been elected Provost, the Vicarage of S. Mary's would not have been vacated ; and none of us know how many there have been, in whose lives the occupation of S. Mary's by Mr. Newman, from 1828 to 1841, was, more or less, the turning point.

The new Vicar of S. Mary's had, six years before, achieved for himself what was, at the moment, to those to whom he was not personally known, the most startling success of his life, his election to a fellowship at Oriel College. Those who have known the University only of late years can hardly, by any exercise of the imagination, picture to themselves the place in the university and the Anglican world, which Oriel held in those days. The rich endowments of all the Oxford Colleges have now, for many years, been thrown open to free competition ; and while, in most other respects, many of them offer greater attractions, all are now prizes to be attained by talents, merits, and attainments. There was a time when this was a peculiarity of Oriel. The result, of course, was that for many years the ablest and most promising students of every other college, unless they chanced to have so advantageous a position in their own community that they could hardly be induced to leave it, were drawn (by what would, in our days, be called "natural selection") to Oriel. Nothing, therefore, could well have created more general surprise, than when, at the Oriel Election of 1822, a very young man, not known to any one of the Fellows even by sight or by name, and who never having been at a public school, and having taken no university honours,\* was unknown even by name beyond his own college, was

---

\* Mr. Newman had been prevented by severe illness from distinguishing himself in the university examination of 1820.

preferred to many candidates who, by their past distinction, were generally held to have ensured their success. We may truly say that no college ever gave a stronger proof that it was resolved to do what it felt to be its duty, not what those around would consider most to its honour, than did Oriel College in electing the one man whose name will, in all future times, throw upon it a lustre beyond any that has been reflected upon it by any, or all, of its sons, during the five centuries and a half of its past existence. That its connection with his own name has been and is the special glory of his college he alone, of men in our days, seems not to have suspected ; but, in speaking of the late Bishop Copleston, he gives his testimony to the principles on which its elections were conducted.

“ In the heart of Oxford there is a small plot of ground, hemmed in by public thoroughfares, which has been the possession and the home of one Society for above five hundred years. In the old time of Boniface VIII. and John XXII., in the age of Scotus, and Occam, and Dante, before Wiclif or Huss had kindled those miserable fires, which were to be the ruin of souls innumerable, down to this day ; an unfortunate king of England, Edward II., flying from the field of Bannockburn, is said to have made a vow to the Blessed Virgin to found a religious house in her honour, if he got back in safety. Prompted and aided by his almoner, he decided on placing this house in the city of Alfred ; and the image of our Lady, which is opposite to its entrance, is the token of the vow and its fulfilment to this day. King and almoner have long been in the dust, and strangers have entered into their inheritance, and their creed has been forgotten, and their holy rites disowned ; but day by day a memento is still made by at least one Catholic priest, once a member of that college, for the souls of those Catholic benefactors who fed him there for so many years. The visitor, whose curiosity has been excited by its present fame, gazes with disappointment on a collection of buildings, which have with them so few of the circumstances of dignity or wealth. Broad quadrangles, high halls and chambers, stately walks, or umbrageous gardens, a throng of students, ample revenues, or a glorious history, none of these things were the portion of that old Catholic foundation ; nothing, in short, which, to the common eye, sixty years ago, would give tokens of what it was to be. But it had at that time a spirit working within it, which enabled its inmates to do, amid its seeming insignificance, what no other body in the place could equal ; not a very abstruse gift, or extraordinary boast, but a rare one, the honest purpose to administer the trust committed to them in such a way as their conscience pointed out as the best. So, whereas the colleges of Oxford are self-electing bodies, the Fellows of each perpetually filling up the vacancies which occur in their

number; the members of this foundation determined, at a time when either from evil custom or from ancient statute, such a thing was not known elsewhere, to throw open their fellowships to the competition of all comers, and in the choice of associates henceforth, to cast to the winds every personal motive and feeling, family connection, and friendship, and patronage, and political interest, and local claim, and prejudice, and party jealousy, and to elect solely on public and patriotic grounds. Nay, with a remarkable independence of mind, they resolved that even the table of honours awarded to literary merit by the university, in its new system of examination for degrees, should not fetter their judgment as electors; but that at all risks, and whatever criticism it might cause, and whatever odium they might incur, they would select the men, whoever they were, to be the children of their founder, who they thought in their consciences to be most likely to do honour to his college, most likely to promote the objects which they believed he had at heart."

"Bad men," as it has been said, "know that they are doing wrong, but do not know how wrong;" and so also men who do well often sow the seeds of good of which they have never thought, and which has no apparent connection with their action. If the Oriel elections had followed the old course of things in Oxford only a few years longer, the parish of S. Mary's would never have been committed to John Henry Newman. Adam de Brome, almoner to King Edward II., and joint founder of Oriel College, had himself held the benefice of S. Mary's, and the appointment having been vested in the fellows of the new College by the king, one of their number has always been vicar. Not only did this appointment give him a church in Oxford, it gave him probably the only church which would have led exactly to the kind of work in which he found himself engaged, and to the delivery and publication of the sermons now republished. S. Mary's was a parish very peculiarly circumstanced. Already even in the reign of Edward II. the university buildings occupied much of its area; several "schools" under different names are known to have existed in it, and in particular the university had acquired many exceptional rights in the church itself, and the buildings immediately connected with it. We must not allow ourselves to be carried away to describe the different parts of the ancient fabric in which on great occasions the different orders of the university had the right of holding their meetings. "The theologists," says Dr. Ingram (*"Memorials of Oxford,"* vol. iii.), used to go, at the proclamation of the Bedel, into the congregation House—the chancel of the old church; the non-regents into the chancel of the new church; the decretists into S. Anne's chapel; the physicians into S. Catharine's; the jurists into S. Thomas's; the proctors, with the regents, into Our Lady's



chapel. This last, says Dr. Ingram, is that still known as Adam de Brome's chapel. He gives a curious account of what used to be called the Royal Chapel, now generally known by the title of the Old Congregation-house, which formed the eastern extremity of the old church, and is still an interesting relic: and gives a deed, executed in the 19th year of Henry IV., and "preserved among the patent rolls in the Tower of London," securing it to the university. Over it was a public library, "begun by Bishop Cobham several years before the foundation of Oriel College," although not completed till much later. In short, the history of Saint Mary's church, if it met with a *vates sacer* worthy to celebrate it, might fill a volume, to say nothing of an article, by itself. We have referred to it chiefly because the reader will see how appropriate a cradle it was to the new movement, the beginning of which Dr. Newman characteristically dates from Sunday, July 14, 1833, when Mr. Keble preached the assize sermon in S. Mary's church;\* but which we imagine all men except himself will date rather from the day in February, 1828, when he took possession of the same church as its vicar. Either date connects with the church of S. Mary the now world-wide "movement" which is making itself felt in the backwoods of North America and by the banks of the Ganges, while its fame and importance in England itself is certainly greater than at any former time. Moreover, we have wished to show the origin of that close connection which still exists between S. Mary's Church and the university, a connection which both ministered to the spread of that movement, and also made the church itself its most appropriate home and centre.

The existing church of S. Mary, as the stranger who goes up the High Street now sees it, was built at a later period, partly replacing the ancient buildings of which Dr. Ingram has told us, partly to the south of them. The smaller chapels which still remain have been little more than curiosities of antiquity ever since the adorable Sacrifice ceased to be offered in them, although, as we shall mention, Mr. Newman at one time made use of one of them. The church now used both by the university and the parish consists of a chancel sixty-eight feet by twenty-four, built in the reign of Henry VI. by Walter Lyhart, then Provost of Oriel and afterwards Bishop of Norwich, and a nave and aisles ninety-four feet by fifty-four, added in the third year of Henry VII. The south porch, with its twisted columns, tells its own date. It was built in the eleventh year of Charles I., "at the cost of Dr. Morgan Owen, chaplain to Archbishop Laud, and cost £230."

---

\* "It was published under the title of 'National Apostasy.' I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833."—"Religious Opinions," p. 35.

It figured in the articles of accusation against Laud, because an image of our Blessed Lady bearing in her arms the Divine Infant stood over the entrance, and (says Dr. Ingram) "was defaced by the Parliamentary soldiers about five years after it was erected." The exquisite tower and spire, together 180 feet in height ("the exact height of the spire alone at Salisbury Cathedral"), had been built as early as the reign of Edward I., when the pointed architecture had attained its greatest perfection of beauty.\*

The use made in modern times of the university church is a curious testimony to the stiff, unelastic character of Anglicanism. In great Catholic churches, at Rome itself and in every part of Christendom, nothing is more common than the delivery of a sermon totally unconnected with Mass or any other function. This it has been found impossible to allow in the Church of England—no doubt for good reasons. For if preaching were allowed by itself, it was plain enough that the Puritan party, which has more than once been the great majority of the Church of England, would wholly have dispensed with the use of the Common Prayer, which has always been imposed upon them against their will. Accordingly there is nothing which has been more rigidly prohibited in the Anglican Church than the delivery of a sermon in any church, at any hour of the day, or under any circumstances, unless the whole morning or evening service is read, as a sort of preface to it. It was to enforce this principle that Laud and his school were so strict in putting down "lecturers" wherever it was possible, and compelling those who were tolerated, to read the church prayers before the lecture themselves, instead of leaving it to a curate. The Acts of Parliament make no exceptions except in the case of the two universities, which, by a special exemption, are allowed to have sermons by themselves in the university church, in consideration of the fact that the church prayers are read morning and evening in every college chapel. At Oxford there is a sermon thus delivered morning and afternoon on Sundays in term, and in the morning on Saints' days and on Sundays in vacation. Who shall preach is regulated by ancient custom—which assigns certain occasions to a few great dignitaries of the university, and gives the nomination on Sunday afternoons in Lent and some other days to the Vice-Chancellor; while on most other days the duty falls to the Masters of Arts in turn, so that each may, if he thinks fit, occupy the university pulpit once in his life. Those who did not think it worth while to come to Oxford for this purpose, were formerly required to find a substitute. But this led to the growth of a set of men called "hack preachers," who lived in a great measure by what it brought them in, and whose performances, while they led to the

entire desertion of the university church by all except the few who felt bound to attend by the decorum necessary in high officials, became so intolerable to them, that by a statute, passed in 1818, the office of "Select Preachers" was instituted. They are ten in number, five of whom are nominated every year, and one of them preaches instead of any person whose turn falls on a Sunday in term, unless he does it himself.

On Sunday morning, therefore, at half-past ten o'clock, the preacher, in his academical habit, meets the Vice-Chancellor and heads of colleges in Adam de Brome's chapel, once the lady-chapel of the old church, and the procession moves into the church. The Vice-Chancellor in his robes is preceded by the bedels bearing maces, and followed by the preacher. After him come the Doctors in their robes. When the Vice-Chancellor has reached the point where the way to the pulpit diverges from that to his own seat, he turns and bows to the preacher, who is escorted by one mace to the pulpit. Who does not remember the conversation between Reading and Sheffield, in "Loss and Gain"? "This is a great place," says the reverential boy, fresh from a country parsonage, "and should have a dress. I declare when I first saw the procession of Heads at S. Mary's, it was quite moving. First"—"of course the pokers," interrupted Sheffield—"First the organ, and every one rising; then the Vice-Chancellor is red, and his bow to the preacher who turns to the pulpit; then all the Heads in order, and lastly the Proctors. Meanwhile you see the head of the preacher slowly mounting up the stairs; when he gets in, he shuts to the door, looks at the organ-loft to catch the psalm, and the voices strike up." Sheffield laughed, and then said, "Well, I confess I agree with you in your instance. The preacher is, or is supposed to be, a person of talent; he is about to hold forth; the Divines, the students of a great University, are all there to listen. The pageant does but fitly represent the great moral fact which is before us. I understand this. I don't call this fudge. What I mean by fudge is outside without inside. Now I must say the sermon itself and not the least of all the prayer before it—what do they call it?" "The bidding prayer," said Reading. "Well, both sermon and prayer are often arrant fudge. I don't often go to University sermons, but I have gone often enough not to go again without compulsion. The last preacher I heard was from the country. Oh, it was wonderful!"

Unfortunately, besides Sheffield's friends "from the country," who come by rotation and too often think it necessary to be unusually grand on the occasion, the high dignitaries, the Select Preachers themselves, and even the Bampton lecturer, who delivers eight very long (and usually very dreary) dissertations in the summer term, are in many cases chosen merely by interest, and

without any reference to their qualifications. Of one Bampton lecturer, (doubtless a most respectable country clergyman,) it was the talk of the University, that his appointment was a sort of medical experiment on the part of a friend who happened to be Dean of Christ Church. His wife had abandoned him; and he was so much prostrated by the blow that the Dean thought the best method of treatment would be the excitement of preaching the Bampton lectures. The Dean was overheard one Sunday, as he left the church, estimating the success of his experiment, which it is to be hoped was complete; but the University, after hearing the lectures, unanimously agreed that the false step of the unhappy lady was not without some excuse. Churches were no doubt intended to bring consolation to mourners, and to teach men to be charitable in their judgments even of the greatest offenders. Still, one would hardly say that this was exactly the way in which they were to bring about either of those good results.

On the whole, the University sermons got a much worse name than they really deserved. A clergyman of high academical distinction defended himself for taking a country walk when he ought to have been at S. Mary's, by saying, "I prefer 'sermons from stones' to sermons from sticks;" and men less witty, especially among the juniors, expressed the same feeling in their own less polished terms. In fact, it was grossly exaggerated. Sticks no doubt there were; some very dry, and some even less attractive, because the atmosphere of S. Mary's drew from them flowers, not less surprising but much less beautiful, than those on the prophet's rod of old. Yet whoever looks back to the old lists of Select Preachers will find, that although such were by no means wanting, there were among them names which would go far to compensate for those of many sticks; and of which those of the present Archbishop of Westminster, the Bishop of Oxford, John Keble, and John Henry Newman were samples. In truth, there were, even then, persons who thought that a man would be fortunate if the average of the sermons he heard were as much calculated to suggest serious thoughts as the average of those preached before the University.

The infection of our subject has betrayed us to discuss this too much at length. All earthly things, however, do sooner or later come to an end—even the most tedious of Bampton lectures; and the University sermon ended, the church rapidly emptied, and after a very short pause the Vicar of S. Mary's came in in surplice and hood, and read the Morning Prayers (without a sermon), for the benefit of his parishioners. The attendance, it must be owned, was scanty—small blame to any one; for the parish has shared the fate of many within the city of London. In the heart of Oxford, it was once no doubt populous, but the University has gradually shouldered out

the parish population. Colleges and public buildings cover most part of its area, and although there remain a bank and a few topping shops, the dwelling-house, even in most of these cases, is chiefly let in lodgings to University men. Somewhat more than a century ago, the space between the church and the present square of the schools was occupied by small houses densely peopled. But the eccentric Dr. Radcliffe (of whose marvellous medical skill and foresight, as well as of his rude and ungallant sayings, our great grandfathers have handed down so many incredible stories) left a considerable part of his immense gains to buy and clear that space, and to erect in the middle of it the scientific library which bears his name. This was made over to the University in 1749, since which time the memory of S. Mary's parish has hardly been kept up, except by the magnificent church. Of the poorer classes in particular, there has been literally not one, except so far as they have been represented by the servants in well-to-do houses. Every Sunday morning, however, and at four in the afternoon, the parish service had always followed the University sermons, and in the afternoon there had always been a sermon.

The vicar who resigned S. Mary's in 1828 had been (as the "Apologia" witnesses) "a very striking preacher." He had been Select Preacher in the university in 1825 and 1826, in which capacity his sermons had been by far the most interesting of any. But yet it was seldom that even one or two members of the university had been seen at the parish service in his day. In the earlier part of Mr. Newman's incumbency the same was the case, nor had he any wish that it should be otherwise. In 1840 he wrote, "I think I may truly say that I have begun scarcely any plan but for the sake of my parish." So it was, however, that (as he says in the same letter), "every one has turned, independently of me, into the direction of the university." Very soon after he became vicar he began, what was then exceedingly rare in the Established Church, Saints' day services in the church. It was impossible that the congregation could be other than very small, and he therefore held them in the chancel, which is divided off by a solid stone screen, so as to be, to all intents, a separate chapel. There it was that he delivered the short addresses of which he speaks in the advertisement to the original edition of the second volume.\*

It has been the writer's practice upon Festivals, in the course of the Morning Service appointed for each, to read a lecture on some subject rising out of it. With a view of making it duly subordinate to the more direct religious duties of the day, he has usually confined himself to a few remarks introduced, without text, into the body of the service, in accordance with the

---

\* It does not appear in the new edition.

directions of our Church, which (after the example of primitive usage) assigns, whether for catechising or for the sermon, a place between the reading of Scripture and the prayers.

These Saints' day services had not gone on many months before he added to them, what was certainly at that moment less known in the Established Church than it had ever been before, daily morning service in the same place. The chancel had neither pulpit nor reading-desk, nor pews nor seats of any kind, except one bench running all round the walls on its south, west, and north sides; in front of which there was a low desk, on which the congregation leant when kneeling. The vicar took his place on a level with them, in the seat occupied by the Dean in his cathedral, on the right hand of the entrance from the nave. Standing there, and of course in his surplice, he delivered the "short discourses" he mentions.

By degrees, however, one and another of the members of the university found his way into these parochial services. One or two who had come home from their walk after the afternoon prayers had begun, would be seen standing under the undergraduates' gallery, where they could come in without disturbing the congregation, which was sprinkled through the seats prepared for the Doctors and Masters of Arts at the University sermon. The prayers and lessons were read in the senior Proctor's seat. The early morning prayers in the chancel were chiefly attended by a few senior Masters of Arts, who, for different reasons and objects, were living in Oxford, and by the ladies of their families. In the long vacation, when the college chapels were generally closed, a few undergraduates, who had stayed in Oxford to study, were commonly added. From this, perhaps, came the vague notion alluded to in "Loss and Gain," that residence in vacation was "a mark of party." It is curious and very mournful to think of the different directions into which has been scattered the little band which was wont to meet there in the bright calm of those summer mornings.

This weekly communion Mr. Newman mentions, in the letter of 1840, as the only one of his parochial plans which he began with any thought of the university men. The Protestant communion was administered in the college chapels once in each term, and in the vacations only on Easter day—four times in all in the year, which naturally suggested the thought of placing it more frequently within the reach of those who had of their own accord sought him out as their teacher.

Writing in these days, it is well to notice that the original author of the Oxford movement never went out in what may be called the æsthetic direction. The services at S. Mary's were the same that they



had been in the time of the late vicar (now Provost of Oriel), except that they gradually became much more numerous. Although the short lectures on Saints' days were, almost of necessity, delivered without change of vestment, the pulpit of S. Mary's was never invaded by the surplice, a practice which in those days was suspected of a party air. It was probably by the reverence and admiration with which the preacher began to be regarded by men of all schools and opinions, and of every different age, that those who were not his intimate friends were gradually attracted to his preaching. And few there were who having begun to attend it did not consider the impossibility of continuing to attend it as one, at least, of the chief losses involved in their ceasing to reside in Oxford.

Almost all Protestant clergymen, in our days, are easily to be distinguished from laymen by their dress; while many of the High Church School closely imitate that of Catholic priests. It will assist readers in our day to imagine Oxford forty years ago, if we mention, that the dress of the clergy was generally the same as that of the laymen of their own standing. What that was may be seen, to mention one example, in Richmond's print of John Keble. It consisted, morning as well as evening, of a suit of black cloth (the coat being such as is now considered as exclusively evening dress), with a large white neckcloth and upstanding collars; and, as a general rule, shoes. The alternative was, Wellington boots. In those days, no master of arts ever left his room to go into the town, without putting on, over this dress, his black academical gown and cap. The undergraduates wore in summer coloured waistcoats and trowsers, and the less respectable portion of them, even in those days, had a sort of pride in going into the town, "in beaver." But this was always forbidden and checked by the authorities. For riding, walking into the country, or for boating, no one wore the University dress. For about the last eighteen years, we believe, the authorities, instead of enforcing the use of the University habit, have imitated the custom of the more "slang" portion of their pupils, which has of course become universal. It is impossible to imagine anything in much worse taste, than that the members of an University of world-wide fame should regard as a disgrace, of which they are eager to rid themselves, the costume which identifies them with so many generations of great men. If the present inhabitants of the Colleges feel it as a satire to be thus publicly marked out as the successors of men whom many of them are so unworthy to represent (as the last degenerate heir of the great house of Condé is known to have refused to assume the title made illustrious by his ancestors), it is only to be regretted that so commendable a feeling has found out no better mode of expressing itself. We live in hopes of hearing, that in this age of revivals, the University has resumed its distinctive costume. Be this as

it may, such as was then the customary dress of clergymen in Oxford, such was without variation that of the man so much accused of innovation. Being exceedingly short-sighted, nobody had ever seen him without silver spectacles. There was among his pupils a tradition which by many, we believe, was regarded as a myth, that had once or twice been known to take them off for a moment in lecture, and that the change made him look like another man. Certainly a man might have attended his lectures for months or even for years without seeing anything of the kind. It was added that being quite unable to see without them, he was obliged, when he wished to resume them, to feel for them on the table. Spectacles, however, only lengthen the sight directly in front; and consequently it was noticed that objects on one side or a little behind him, often escaped unseen. The time came when this was a decided gain to a man who was one of the very last to enjoy the consciousness—*quod monstror digito prætereuntium*. It was impossible that any man could be more happily unconscious, that as he walked rapidly along the High Street, his head a little elevated, and looking straight before him, there were seldom wanting strangers to whom he was being eagerly pointed out by some Oxford man. Photography had not in those days made the features of all celebrated men familiar to all the world; and the well-known print by Robinson after George Richmond, did not appear till he had been for some time a Catholic, although the picture was taken before.

It is to be remembered that the "Apologia" was not intended as an autobiography (as many readers seem to have imagined), but as an account of the gradual development of the convictions which led one who began with a nervous horror of Rome and a hearty belief in the Church of England, into the bosom of the Catholic Church. As he expresses his object, "I must show—what is the very truth—that the doctrines which I hold, and have held for so many years, have been taught me (speaking humanly) partly by the suggestions of Protestant friends, partly by the teaching of books, and partly by the action of my own mind; and thus shall I account for that phenomenon which to so many seems so wonderful, that I should have left 'my kindred and my father's house' for a Church from which I once turned away with dread."

This being Dr. Newman's purpose in his work, he has not even mentioned, much less explained, the fact that not very long after he became Vicar of S. Mary's, he ceased to be college tutor at Oriel. Others have no right without his permission or knowledge, to ask reasons which he has evidently wished to avoid. It is only because the publication of that volume has given to all readers a right to know and discuss many of the events of his past life, that we have felt ourselves at liberty to say so much as we

have, of one whom we have still the happiness of having among us. The fact, however, of his so soon ceasing to be tutor, although continuing to reside in the university, had a very material influence upon his after career. Never thinking beneath his attention the details of any position to which the Providence of God had called him, he had never contented himself, during his college tutorship, with the college lectures which his predecessors in the office had found abundant occupation. There are men still living, who will remember that whereas the students of the college had always before found it necessary to engage private tutors (which occasioned a very great increase of their necessary expenses) if they aimed at university honours, Mr. Newman's pupils found this needless, because he gave to each of them partly in private lectures, additional to the regular lectures of the college (to which his predecessors had confined themselves), partly in personal intercourse, walking with them, &c., so much of his time and attention, as to render any other private tutor, except for mathematics, a needless expense. Mathematics, to which his attention had been little turned, he was beginning to study expressly for the same purpose. While thus engaged, his time was fully occupied. Indeed, it was the over exertion, caused by adding the work of public examiner to that of college tutor (before he became Vicar of S. Mary's), that brought on the illness mentioned in the "Apologia" at the end of 1827. If he had continued tutor, his Sunday sermons alone would have taken more time than he could have given. It is hardly possible that the eight volumes of "Parochial and Plain Sermons," by which this article is headed, and the volume of University Sermons, could have been written, to say nothing of others never published. Still less could he have made the visit to the Mediterranean, of the beauties of which he wrote : \*—

Store them in heart ! Thou shalt not faint  
 'Mid coming pains and fears,  
 As the third Heaven once cheered a Saint  
 For fourteen trial-years.

But above all, it would have been impossible that he should have devoted himself to the study of theology and ecclesiastical history, which alone opened his eyes, and through him those of many others, to the fact that the *Via Media* of Anglicanism was untenable, and that he must look out elsewhere for firm land upon which he could set his foot. An able man, whose views were somewhat bounded by the routine of Oxford life, spoke as if, in ceasing to be tutor, he would no longer have any opportunity of usefulness. In reply it was observed to be strange that he should think it impossible for

---

\* "Lyra Apostolica."

a man to be usefully employed upon anything else than a tutorship at Oriel. There were already those who saw farther. "If Newman ceases to be tutor," said Robert Isaac Wilberforce at the time, "his genius will soon pervade the university." There had not been time to forget the prediction before it was abundantly fulfilled.

It is as a preacher that we are now considering him. But in that special point of view we must remind our readers of what the "Apologia" has told them, that the "History of the Arians" was published at the end of 1833, having been finished in the early part of 1832; the necessity of change, after the extreme exertion spent upon it, having led him to join Hurrell Froude and his father in their visit to the Mediterranean. It was published as soon as he returned from Sicily, restored from the very gates of death. The next year appeared the first volume of *Parochial Sermons*, inscribed, "in affectionate acknowledgment of the blessing of his long friendship and example," to Dr. Pusey, then just made Regius Professor of Hebrew. Vol. ii. is dated Feb. 21, 1835; vol. iii., Feb. 1836; vol. iv., Nov. 1838; vol. v., Oct. 1840; vol. vi., Quinquagesima, 1842. These dates will help the reader to picture to himself how speedily, yet surely and progressively, the leaven of the preacher's influence was spreading through the university. The university sermons, less generally interesting as they treat of more difficult and abstract subjects, were not published till 1843. But a circumstance connected with them will throw light on our immediate subject. In July, 1826, and again in April, 1832, he preached by the nomination of two different Vice-Chancellors; in 1831 and 1832 as select preacher. Thus he came as a preacher ever more and more before the eyes of the university. "St. Peter's Day," 1840, happened to fall on a Monday, and in the "commemoration" week, which everybody gave up to amusement, although the time had not yet come when the rage for "Athletics" had compelled the tutors and professors of Oxford, in despair, to give up all idea of study in the summer term. On a saint's day, at any season of the year, a dozen would not have been an unusually small congregation. But on that day the church was full to overflowing, alike with the graduates and undergraduates. This was an university sermon: but the fact we mention makes it less surprising that the parish services became gradually well attended by university men.

Nor is it to be supposed that this was a mere fashion among the undergraduates of the university. On the contrary, it was decidedly among them that attendance at the parish services at S. Mary's was least common. It is by no means rare to find men who, after taking their degree as Bachelor of Arts, regarded the opportunity of attending them among the most valuable privileges of an

Oxford residence, but who will acknowledge with regret that they never went as undergraduates and perhaps never even heard of them. The largest proportion of the attendants no doubt was supplied by the younger men who had passed out of the state of pupilage—the bachelors and junior masters—in other words, by those who were to give its character to the Oxford of the next generation. But it would be a mistake to imagine that during the earlier years there was the least jealousy on the part of the authorities. The family of the present Bishop of Chichester were regular attendants while he was Vice-Chancellor of the university. Nay, there were colleges which gave the strongest possible proof of their wish that their members should attend Mr. Newman's preaching. The afternoon services began, as we have said, at 4 p.m., and the colleges dined at five. Oriel had always been an exception. The vicar of S. Mary's has always been a resident fellow; and it was the parish church of the college servants. To enable them to attend, the dinner at Oriel had always been half an hour later on Sundays. We have heard that there were colleges which at this time changed their hour on purpose to allow their men to attend S. Mary's without deserting the hall.

What the sermons were which made so deep an impression on the somewhat critical members of the university, the volumes before us will in a great measure enable our readers to see. They are reprinted to the letter from the last edition published by Rivingtons, while Mr. Newman was still an Anglican incumbent. If they were to be republished at all this was the only possible course. They could not, by any possible correction or expurgation, be turned into Catholic sermons. Not that there is in any of them a word against the Church, or, so far as we are aware, against any one Catholic doctrine or practice. He tells us, indeed, that, until 1841, his "imagination was stained" by the effects of the teaching of Newton on the Prophecies, which had led him to regard the successor of S. Peter as the predicted Antichrist. Those who spoke or corresponded with him in 1828 and the following years may remember how much this was the case. But it was exactly, as he says, a stain on the imagination. It formed no part of the man or of his practical system, and certainly never entered into his preaching. But his sermons were not the work of a Catholic, and therefore necessarily reviewed everything from another point of view. As well might you retouch a picture of S. Mary's Church from the south, to turn it into one of the same church from the north, as hope by modification of the words to change the sermons of a man who was feeling his way under the guidance of Scripture and of the Anglican prayer-book, and "trusting the lore of his own loyal heart," into those of a man who taught "with authority," feeling under his feet the *soliditas Petri*. The difference could not be better illus-

trated than by comparing, say the first volume of the "Parochial Sermons" with those in the "Discourses to Mixed Congregations." The alternative therefore really was either to suppress altogether volumes which have been widely useful, and which we may hope will be so again, or to allow an Anglican friend on his own responsibility to republish them as they were. As they stand, moreover, they are a great whole. They show what was the moral and religious posture of a man, who, during the years in which they were written and preached, was feeling his way in the dark, he knew not whither, but was led ever nearer and nearer to the one true Church, by the Gracious Hand whose guidance he had invoked. A great lesson would be lost if any of these sermons had been suppressed or even if the order in which they were published had been altered. And what better preparation can there be to directly Catholic teaching, than that which impresses upon the English nation, with a force which has perhaps never been equalled, the great and solemn truths which are the subject of these volumes? God grant that such teaching might always be heard in every Protestant church, as long as any congregation in England remains separated from the one Church!

We have said that these volumes will, "in a great measure," enable the reader to understand what was the teaching which aroused the deep sleep of the University of Oxford between 1828 and 1841. He will not need to be told that there was a something which neither the press nor the most skilful pencil can ever perpetuate, in the whole manner and delivery of the preacher. What that was we utterly despair of giving even a faint idea, to any man who did not witness it. To those who are justly penetrated with the force and beauty of these printed sermons, one can only say with *Æschines*, 'what if you had heard himself pronounce it?' and yet nothing could at first sight be more opposite to the manner of the great Athenian orator. The sermons here published were all not only written but, according to the custom which, many years before, had become more than a custom, all but a law, with Anglican preachers, were read. Action, in the common sense of the word, there was none. Through many of them the preacher never moved anything but his head. His hands were literally not seen, from the beginning to the end. The sermon began in a calm musical voice, the key slightly rising as it went on: by-and-by the preacher warmed with his subject; it seemed as if his very soul and body glowed with sternly-suppressed emotion. There were times, when in the midst of the most thrilling passages he would pause, without dropping his voice, for a moment which seemed long, before he uttered with gathered force and solemnity a few weighty words. The very tones of his voice seemed as if they were something more than his own. There are those who,



to this day, in reading many of the sermons in the volumes before us, have the whole scene brought back before them. The great church, the congregation which barely filled it, all breathless with expectant attention. The gas-light, just at the left hand of the pulpit, lowered that the preacher might not be dazzled; themselves perhaps standing in the half-darkness under the gallery, and then the pause before those words in the "Ventures of Faith" (vol. iv.) thrilled through them—"They say unto Him we are able"—or those in the seventh sermon of the sixth volume, "The Cross of Christ."

Nor should the manner of reading the Psalms and the Scripture lessons in the service which preceded the sermon be passed over. Its chief characteristics were the same. Why is it that while many things at the time even more impressive have faded from the memory; one scene, or perhaps one cadence, remains fixed in it for life? Thus it is that one who more than forty years ago stood just before him almost a boy in the college chapel, has at this moment in his ears the sound of the words, "Oh magnify the Lord our God and worship Him upon His holy hill—for *the Lord our God is Holy.*"

Those were days never to be recalled in this world. Converts may thank God that He has given them blessings far beyond anything of which they then dreamed. They have found, in coming into the Church of God, from which they then shrunk with a fear not wholly blameable because it sprung from a misguided conscience, that "the things we feared are nowhere to be found, the things for which we hoped are beyond all that we could ask or think." Yes, so it is felt by many with deep thankfulness to Him, Who gave them then a blessing denied to their Protestant ancestors through all the past time that the Anglican Church had lasted, that by it He might prepare them, though they knew not what He was doing, for greater blessings still. But the things that have gone by will never again be seen. And they still look back to those distant years, as the children of Israel long after they had been put in possession of the "land flowing with milk and honey," must have felt, in remembering those mornings when the glow of dawn was setting fire to the eastern horizon in the wilderness, and when they went forth from the camp, to gather from the desert sands the supply of manna for the day.

How it was that this influence, so attractive to any man both in itself and as an instrument of usefulness, was, not lost but deliberately laid aside, the "Apologia" has in part told us. There is not the least reason to imagine, that any but he who wielded it could have shaken or diminished it. The Anglican establishment might, if he had so pleased, have been in time as completely "pervaded" by his genius, as the University already was. The first shock to it seemed to have been given by the publication of Froude's "Remains," in Feb., 1838. Many things in that volume seemed at the time to

have been rashly published. But this was a step deliberately taken by men who had no doubt that the Church of England was Catholic, and to whom, while deeply convinced of its faults and corruptions, the idea of abandoning it had never occurred. It was so far from really lessening the influence of those responsible for it, that Mr. Keble, who supplied it with a preface, has been more nearly canonized by the Church of England than any man, not a king, has ever been in the course of its history ; and of himself Mr. Newman says, "In the spring of 1839, my position in the Anglican Church was at its height. I had supreme confidence in my controversial *status*, and I had a great, and still growing success in recommending it to others." Clearly, therefore, the growth of Mr. Newman's influence in the Anglican Church was not blighted by Froude's "Remains," published more than a year before.

How that influence came to an end, the readers of the "Apologia" now know. It was known and understood at the time by the few whom Mr. Newman had honoured with a confidence which pierced their very souls with grief and terror, when he told them of his first doubts, whether the Anglican Church was really Catholic. So careful was he not to suggest a misgiving to the minds of others before he was absolutely certain that duty demanded of him to do so, that he has left it on record, that for \* two years and four months after the "frightful suspicion," strongly impressed his mind, he disclosed it to only two intimate friends. But that "suspicion" was the key to his whole conduct. It was in the beginning of October, 1839, that he made the astounding confidence, mentioning the two subjects which had inspired the doubt, the position of S. Leo in the Monophysite controversy, and the principle, "*securus judicat orbis terrarum*" in that of the Donatists. He added that he felt confident that when he returned to his rooms and was able fully and calmly to consider the whole matter, he should see his way completely out of the difficulty. But, he said, I cannot conceal from myself, that for the first time since I began the study of theology, a vista has been opened before me, to the end of which I do not see. He was walking in the New Forest, and he borrowed the form of his expression from the surrounding scenery. His companion, upon whom such a fear came like a thunderstroke, expressed his hope that Mr. Newman might die rather than take such a step. He replied, with deep earnestness,

---

\* "Religious Opinions," page 162, he says : "I disclosed to Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, I do not know in what words, my frightful suspicion, hitherto only known to two persons, viz. his brother Henry, and Mr., now Sir Frederick Rogers, that as regards my Anglicanism, perhaps I might break down in the event, that perhaps we were both out of the Church." The answer to this letter was dated Jan. 29, 1842. It had been (see page 114) at the end of August 1839, that he first was seriously alarmed.

that he had thought if ever the time should come when he was in serious danger, of asking his friends to pray, that, if it was not indeed the will of God, he might be taken away before he did it. Of such a meanwhile he spoke only as a possibility in the future, by no means as of a thing that had already arrived. But he added, with especial reference to Dr. Wiseman's article on the Donatists, "It is quite necessary that I should give a satisfactory answer to it, or I shall have the young men around me\*—such men," he added, "as Ward of Balliol—going over to Rome." Hopeful, however, as he still was, it was impossible not to feel

Hæret lateri lethalis arundo ;

for he would walk some time in silent musing, and then say, "One thing I am sure I can promise you, that I shall never take such a step unless Keble and Pusey agree with me that it is a duty." At another time, "I wonder whether such a step would be justifiable if an hundred of us saw it to be their duty to take it with me?" These words may not be quite exact, but the deep wound which they branded upon the inmost soul of the hearer makes it quite impossible that they should not be correct in substance.

To his own rooms he retired, and he describes, in the "*Apologia*," how completely he satisfied his own mind. But he never settled down again exactly into his old position. Before August, 1839, he had always both spoken and written of the Roman Church in the strong language of condemnation which he had learned from the great Anglican writers ; of whom it must be said that, however Catholic they might seem on any other subject, the very mention of the Pope acted as a chemical test, to precipitate, in a moment, their latent Protestantism. He no longer maintained the *via Media*, or attacked Rome as schismatical. His new position was that "Rome is the Church, and we are the Church," and "there is no need to inquire which of the two has most deflected from the Apostolical standard." This is the view he puts forward in the article on "the Catholicity of the English Church," which appeared in Jan. 1840, and was the first result of his restored tranquillity of mind. We mention this change for the sake of pointing out a very characteristic allusion to it, in "Loss and Gain," which we have never seen noticed. Although "free use is made in it of sayings and doings which are characteristic of the time and the place in which the scene is laid," there are only two passing references to Mr. Newman himself, and both times he is curtly mentioned as "Smith." At the end of the sixteenth chapter Reading and Bateman are talking with a thoughtful bystander, Campbell. "Did you hear

---

\* This is evidently the party described in the "*Religious Opinions*," p. 163, chap. iv.

the report?" said Reading. "I did not think much of it myself, that Smith was moving." "Not impossible," answered Campbell, thoughtfully. "Impossible—quite impossible," cried Bateman, "such a triumph to the enemy. I will not believe it till I see it." "Not impossible," repeated Campbell, as he buttoned and fitted his great coat about him. "*He has shifted his ground.*"

Our object is not to repeat the history of the gradual working of his mind, which has been told, as none else could tell it, in the "*Apologia*;" but to point out that, although he so entirely satisfied his own mind as to speak of his feelings of discomfort completely as a thing of the past, in a letter to his most intimate friend, dated Feb. 21, 1840,\* the effect of the temporary shake was to make him withdraw, one after another, from every situation and means of influence in the university. His conduct seemed at the time simply unaccountable to those around him, who saw that he was gradually withdrawing himself from his post at a moment when his influence and power of doing good was greater than it had ever been. But those whom he had admitted to his confidence could not help feeling, with ever-increasing dread, that the momentary shake must have left behind it some effects more permanent than he was himself aware of. It was no step taken under impulse, but a deliberate course of action. He retired as much as possible to Littlemore, a hamlet of about 400 souls, "an integral part of the parish of S. Mary's, between two and three miles from Oxford," where he had built a church several years before, and where he now "bought ten acres of land," designing a "monastic home." He also formed the plan of giving up S. Mary's, and postponed it only in deference to the opinion of the friend whom he most trusted. He actually gave up the editorship of the "*British Critic*." Meanwhile he could not avoid explaining how he reconciled his new views with regard to Rome and her teaching, with the Thirty-nine Articles. He did this in the *Tract for the Times*, No. 90; and when that view was rejected by the existing authorities of the Anglican Church, he still more withdrew himself. Between Christmas and Easter, 1843, he preached at S. Mary's only five times.† After that only once more as an Anglican, when he preached at Littlemore, on giving up his benefice. The sermon preached that day, and entitled "*The Parting of Friends*," is published in the volume on "*Subjects of the Day*." Never can the scene which took place when it was delivered be forgotten by any one who heard these words, "think of such an one in years to come." That volume appeared in print after he had ceased to hold office in the Anglican communion, "when I had no call to restrain expression of anything which I myself hold," and

---

\* "*Religious Opinions*," p. 129.

† *Ib.* p. 312.

“ in preparing it for publication, a few words and sentences have in several places been added, which will be found to express more of private or personal opinion than it was expedient to introduce into the instruction delivered in church to a parochial congregation.”

Probably this is one reason why that volume does not form part of Mr. Copeland's edition. We cannot, however, help regretting that it does not. It contains some of the most striking and beautiful sermons ever published. It is, besides, a necessary part of the author's biography. Nor is there really anything in it inconsistent with Anglicanism; if indeed it can be said what is so: certainly nothing half so “strong,” to use the phrase of the day, as much which is now published without exciting any surprise. The wonderful influence in the University and the Church of England, of which we have already spoken, was then thrown down by the same hands by which it had been erected. It had never been sought for or desired. It had been accepted only because it came spontaneously, as the natural, nay, inevitable result of devoting to the service of God, the genius He had given, and the situation to which it had been the means of raising him who had received it. It was at once laid down without a sigh, as soon as it appeared, that it could not be retained without something like concealment, artifice, or manœuvre. In “resigning his place in the movement,” he wrote to the then Bishop of Oxford: “I have nothing to be sorry for; except having made your Lordship anxious, and others whom I am bound to revere. I have nothing to be sorry for, but everything to rejoice in and be thankful for. I have never taken pleasure in seeming to be able to move a party; and whatever influence I have had has been found, not sought after. I have acted because others did not act, and have sacrificed a quiet which I prized. May God be with me in time to come, as He has been hitherto! And He will be, if I can but keep my hands clean and my heart pure. I think I can bear, or at least will try to bear, any personal humiliation; so that I am preserved from betraying sacred interests which the Lord of Grace and Power has given into my charge.”

And so the scene closed and the curtain fell.

---

## ART. III.—S. JOHN DAMASCENE.

*S. Joannis Damasceni Opera omnia.* Parisiis : Migne. 1864.

IN treating of the greater Fathers of the Church, one circumstance of some importance is often not sufficiently considered. It is remarkable how many of them were almost contemporaries. In other words, the age of patristic literature was a very short one. It is true that books make it last from the death of the Apostle S. John to the middle of the eighth century for the Greeks, and even later for the Latins. But put on one side the early Alexandrian and African writers, omit S. Gregory the Great and Venerable Bede, and the Fathers may almost be said to begin with Athanasius and end with Leo the Great (330-461). It was precisely in the century thus marked out that the great heresies ran their course. Arianism commenced in the youth of Athanasius; Leo gave the death-blow to Eutychianism. After the Council of Chalcedon, the course of Church history passes from the grand to the comparatively insignificant. The spirit of evil seems to abandon his standards and disband his intellectual army, scattering guerilla troops over the land, and playing revengeful antics where he was impotent to strike a great blow. The history of the Monophysite and Monothelite controversies that went on from the fourth Council to the sixth (451-680), for two centuries and a half, is a history of stupid emperors, weak pastors, and foolish populations. And, on the other hand, the intellectual spokesmen of the Church do not altogether exhibit the great qualities of their predecessors. When the whole question was whether a given bishop was or was not telling a lie when he said he received the Canons of Chalcedon, it could hardly be expected that a Cyril or a Basil would undertake to settle the matter. When a theological emperor, instead of keeping the Saracens out of Syria, devoted himself to composing a *Typus* or an *Ecthesis*, the eloquence of a Nazianzen would have been thrown away on a people and a clergy who were so demoralized as not to see the folly of it without being told. Theodoret of Cyrus, the last great name that has rendered illustrious the School of Antioch, died about 458, seventeen years after the Fathers of Chalcedon had abstained from condemning his



language about S. Cyril. From his death to the end of the next century but one, hardly a great name appears in Greek patrology, and hardly an eloquent word has been bequeathed to the world from those episcopal sees and intellectual centres of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, that had made themselves so clearly heard against Arius, Nestorius, Apollinaris, and Eutyches. At the beginning of the eighth century, two hundred and fifty years after the death of Theodoret, we seem to meet once more with a hero after the ancient mould in the person of John of Damascus.

The scanty gleanings that time has spared of these barren two centuries and a half are probably, however, to be taken rather as samples than as the complete harvest. There were other sophists, rhetoricians, and philosophers, for instance, than Æneas of Gaza, and his countryman and friend, Procopius, who occupied themselves, as these did, with dialogues in the Platonic manner on the immortality of the soul, with panegyrics of the emperors, descriptions of great churches, and commentaries, rather obscure, not to say crabbed, on various parts of Scripture.

If the writer of the treatises that pass under the name of Denis the Areopagite really lived about the year 500, and was not the Areopagite himself, we should not be far wrong in concluding that there were spirits in decaying Alexandria that were worthy to teach on the soil of Origen, and to inherit the traditions of the schools of S. Mark. On the other hand, perhaps Cosmas *Indicopleustes*, who went on his pilgrimages by land and water about the time when Constantinople was raging over Origen and the *Three Chapters*, was a solitary and exceptionable instance. Cosmas, from a merchant, became a monk; in the quiet of his monastery he wrote his travels. Perhaps a few merchants did turn monks in these times; but very few monks cared to write down what they had seen in the world. Evagrius of Antioch was writing his elegant history when S. Gregory the Great was rebuking John the Faster; if there were others like him, we must regret their works have not been spared. Anastasius, the monk of Sinai, who seems to have been, towards the end of the sixth century, the type of what a preaching friar was to be in the thirteenth, has left us in his written controversies and ascetical works no mean idea of the culture and piety of the monastic populations of Arabia. Another Athanasius, almost a contemporary, was Patriarch of Antioch, and translated the *Pastorals* of S. Gregory the Great into Greek. S. John Climacus was another Sinaite monk, and lived towards the same time. From another great monastery or *laura*, that of

S. Sabas, near Jerusalem, we have also one or two distinguished names. The monk Antiochus, who lived in the reign of Justinian (527-65), has left us, in his 130 short discourses, a sample of the pastoral teaching of his time. A greater name than he is John Moschus, who after pilgrimages to many monasteries in Syria, Egypt, and even the West, has given the result of his experience and the flower of his multifarious gatherings in the famous *Spiritual Meadow*, a book that mediæval monks knew as well of as those who first read it upon the burning hills of Judæa. A still greater name is that of S. Sophronius, by birth a Damascene, by education an Alexandrian (as Moschus also most probably was), and then a member of the laura of S. Sabas. If S. Sophronius had written nothing but the great dogmatic letter on the rising Monothelite heresy, his name would be for ever venerable. This letter shows us a bishop, who, without the eloquence or the genius of those who had flourished two hundred and fifty years before, has yet a firm grasp of traditional dogma and a fearless courage in deciding the novel questions of the day about the twofold operation of Jesus Christ. In addition to this great monument, S. Sophronius has left a few ascetical works and discourses, and, not the least pleasing, a considerable amount of simple but elegant verse, on our Lord, the saints, the festivals, and other subjects. A contemporary of Sophronius, though he outlived him by more than twenty years, was S. Maximus, the highborn minister of Heraclius, who became a monk to avoid the troubles of Monothelism, a controversialist when he found it impossible to avoid them, and finally a martyr, in will and merit, for his resistance to Constans and his *Typus*. The style of S. Maximus is not pleasing, but he is pious, and rich in the mystic sense. His controversial writings, as we have them, are perhaps not fair specimens of his powers, as they seem to have been taken down from the living voice in his conferences with Pyrrhus and others. A characteristic of his writings is his use of scholastic terms.

The death of S. Maximus brings us nearly to the end of the seventh century (662). Twenty years later (680), the sixth Council closed an epoch, and the Monothelite heresy, that had in one shape or another kept emperors and bishops busy for a hundred years, disappears from dignified history, and sinks to a party cry of Jacobite factions in some of the cities that Mahometanism was already advancing to seize. The writers, whose names have been mentioned, are of all classes — bishops, monks, ministers, philosophers, historians, ascetics. We can see that, in spite of universal decay, bishops still upheld the faith, monasteries still flourished,

and literary pursuits still went on in Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria. We see that from the Council of Chalcedon to the second of Constantinople, the great matter of controversy, and the staple of half the writings of the period, was the error of Eutyches and its consequences. We might see, if we studied the history of the time, how one consequence of this endless disputing was an even more conspicuous and remarkable exhibition than had hitherto been given of the supremacy of the Roman See. "Acquiescing in the dogmatic letter of the holy Pope Agatho," so run the acts of the sixth Council, "we proclaim in Jesus Christ two natures, with two wills and two proper operations. We have followed the teaching of the Pope, and he has followed the tradition of the Apostles and the Fathers. If we have overcome the enemy, the Supreme Head of the Apostles fought with us; for we had at our head his imitator and his heir, the successor of his chair, the holy Pope, who illustrates Catholic truth by his doctrine. O Prince, new Constantine of a new Arius, ancient Rome has presented to you a profession of faith dictated by God Himself. A letter from the West has brought back the truth. Peter has spoken by the mouth of Agatho." It was the only possible termination to the imbecile strife of a degraded people. No more again shall any heresy spread like a pestilence, from sea to sea, from Constantinople to Antioch, from Antioch to Palestine and Egypt. A wave of destruction has gathered in the South, and in the roll of its course, sees and churches, religion and civilization, are being swallowed up. Mahomet fled to Mecca in 622. Fourteen years later, Damascus surrendered to the mercies of Caled, the lieutenant of Omar, and the army that Heraclius had assembled to preserve it, the best that the empire could gather together, and not unworthy even of the palmy days of Rome, was routed with terrific slaughter, and driven to Antioch and the sea-coast. Another year (637), and Jerusalem, newly sanctified by the recovery of the Holy Cross from the Persians, opened its gates after four months' siege, and S. Sophronius, the scourge of the Monothelites, arranged, in a personal interview with Omar himself, the sad conditions of the capitulation. Aleppo, Antioch, Cæsarea, city after city, submitted in despair to the Moslem invaders, and before the middle of the seventh century, while yet Heraclius was dictating his *Ecthesis*, and Constans his *Typus*, the Crescent was master beyond the chain of Taurus to the north, and from the Tigris and Euphrates to the sea-coast.

Among the prizes that were lost to the empire, and gained by the new infidel power during the six years that it took the Arabs to overrun Syria, there was none that pleased them

more than the city of Damascus. From the eastern slopes of Anti-Libanus descend two streams, which, in the days of Naaman the Syrian, were called the Abana and the Pharphar, but now are known as the Barrada and the Phege. Their waters meet other streams that pour down from northern and southern spurs of the same mountain-range, and the multitude of river-courses wander and cross each other over a hundred and fifty square miles of a plain that lies between the foot of Anti-Libanus and the first sands of the Persian desert.

In the very midst of the greenness and luxuriance with which such unusual wealth of water and the sun of Syria have clothed the favoured plain, stands, and has stood since the days of Abraham, the city of Damascus. How long before Abraham's journeyings Damascus was a city we do not know, but it seems certain, that the very first of Sem's children who wandered that way, towards Arabia, or who struck westward from the valley of the Euphrates, must have renounced a nomad life for ever, when they came upon such a terrestrial paradise. It has been said that Damascus is the most productive spot of the whole globe. Its gardens and orchards, its trees and fruits, above all the singular abundance and beauty of its never-failing waters, have been the theme of glowing descriptions ever since descriptions began to be written. To the Greeks, whom Alexander's conquests had brought thither, it was the "eye of all the East." The Arab writers have celebrated it in poetry and in the poetical prose to which their language lends itself so well, until we no longer wonder to hear them make it the site of Paradise. The Prophet himself is a witness to its more than earthly beauty, for the legend is that once, having climbed Anti-Libanus, he stood upon a high precipice looking to the east, with Damascus at two miles distance beneath him, and gazed in rapt meditation over the boundless garden, from whose midst the white walls and roofs shone half hidden, and the waters crossed each other in lines of light. His journey that day should have ended in Damascus; but the story is, that the view of it so moved him, that he would not tempt his frailty by entering it, but turned back and fled; there was but one paradise, he said, designed for man, and, for his part, he was resolved not to take his in this world. Modern travellers, having looked on the city from the same spot on which Mahomet is said to have stood, have written down, that no place in the world offers to the beholder, at a distance, such voluptuous beauty.

This exceptional city, the oldest inhabited site of which there is record in the world, and whose unrecorded history must be yet older, for it is by nature a place for men to con-

gregate, has passed through all the vicissitudes of war and conquest that have affected Syria, of which it is the natural capital. It was the royal city of the Syrian kings in their wars with Israel. David "put garrisons" in it, and in his days and those of his son Syria was subject to Israel. Solomon's magnificence reached beyond the plain of Damascus into the Persian desert, where he built Tadmor in the Wilderness. In those days the road between Damascus and Jerusalem was plain and easy to follow; as was likewise the way from Damascus to Tyre, its ancient seaport, round by the southern extremities of the two great Syrian mountain-ranges. After the Greek conquest, the Seleucidæ built Antioch, and Damascus, not being sufficiently near Greek interests, falls out of sight, and remains what it is by nature, a pleasant place of the earth, an emporium of caravans between the coast and the far East, and a border city that is ever and again held for a brief space by some of the unsubdued Arab tribes of the desert. So it continued when the Roman took up what the Greek could not hold. "Aretas the King," when S. Paul escaped from Damascus by a window in the walls, was probably the Emir of some Arab clan or confederation that, in defiance or by favour of Roman power, held temporary sway over the *Ager Damascenus*. In the history of the Church Damascus plays no conspicuous part after the days of S. Paul. Peter fixed his see at Antioch. It would perhaps have been a boon to perplexed Protestants if Paul had fixed *his* at Damascus. The wide desert which stretched out eastward from its very walls prevented it from ever becoming, to the countries that rest on the Euphrates and the Tigris, a centre of faith, of learning, or of error, such as Edessa was fitted to become. Still, Damascus was a great and important see. The memory of S. Paul contributed to make it a place of pilgrimage. Anchorites found their way into the desert that shuts it in. Justinian built a church there, and the size of the mosque that was once the Christian cathedral shows the scale on which its Christian establishment must have been.

In the year 622 Mahomet fled to Mecca, and in the same year Sergius of Constantinople published the pretended letter of Mennas to Pope Vigilius, which may be said to have inaugurated the heresy of the Monothelites. During the next eleven years all the great sees of the East were agitated by the discussions that ensued. How Damascus acted in the contest we do not know; but when Antioch and Jerusalem, Edessa and the Arabian frontier are mentioned over and over again, it is quite certain that the Church of Damascus was not far from the hottest of the battle. But during these eleven

years a different enemy from the heretic was whetting his sword against the pearl of the East. In the very year in which Sergius wrote his too celebrated letter to Pope Honorius (633), Abu Obeidah and his terrible lieutenant Kaled, surnamed the Sword of God, having stormed Bostra, crossed the Arabian boundaries and advanced to the conquest of Syria. Damascus was the first city that was attacked. To save it, the armies of Heraclius fought their first pitched battle against the Moslems. The Roman army was defeated, with immense slaughter, and Damascus, after a prolonged struggle, in which the siege of Troy seemed to have been played over again on its plains, surrendered to the infidels.

It was perhaps about sixty years after the conquest of Damascus by the Saracens, that is, about the year 690, that was born John of Damascus, or Damascene, the last of the Greek Fathers.\* His family was of the very first rank, and indeed was closely mixed up with the public life of the city. Its name was *Mansur*, and its founder, *El Mansur*, was therefore in all probability an Arab chief whose descendants had held to the city and submitted to Greek civilization. There is a story, which there is no reason to reject entirely, of a Mansur who, at the time of the Arab conquest of Damascus, was of no small assistance to the Moslems. One version affirms that he took the money of the Arab commander, and delivered up the city by treachery. If he did, it would only be what too many of the Christian governors were in those days accustomed to do. But we may believe, with another version of the story, that this Mansur did his best for Heraclius until defeats and blunders had destroyed all chance of successful resistance, and that he finally surrendered to save useless bloodshed. In any case he must have been a leading man among the Christians. It is certain, moreover, that, owing to some cause or other, the Christians of Damascus obtained very favourable terms from the Saracens. For instance, they were allowed the free exercise of their religion, contrary to the invariable practice of the infidels, and were even, for a time, left in possession of their cathedral. The parents of S. John, sixty years after the conquest, had not lost the faith of their fathers. In the midst

---

\* The facts of the life of S. John Damascene are not very plentiful, and not always very certain. The principal account of him is one in Greek, which professes to have been translated, with embellishments, from various Arabic sources. It seems to be the work of John, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was burnt alive by the Saracens in the latter years of Nicephorus Phocas, and to be therefore about the date of 969. It doubtless gives the traditions of the Church of Syria. The Church of Constantinople seems to have differed from it in one or two points of the Saint's history.



of the thorns, we are told, they preserved the flower of godliness and the good odour of the knowledge of Christ. Where many were faithless, they were faithful, and among the great and rich families their race was almost solitary in their unswerving attachment to their religion. Their constancy and their virtue were so remarkable that the very infidels had come to honour it. The father of S. John was very rich. Both in the city and throughout Judæa and Palestine he had great possessions. But the most curious fact in his history is that he was chief minister of the Saracen prince. The caliphs of the dynasty of the Ommaiades had made Damascus the seat of their empire very shortly before the period of which we speak, and it seems that the Saint's father was nothing less than the grand vizier of the reigning caliph. The author of the Life that we chiefly follow lays great stress on this remarkable circumstance, finding fitting parallels only in Daniel and Joseph, and extolling the power of virtue and of the fear of God. The Christian minister used his great power and wealth in doing good wherever his hand found it to do, redeeming Christian captives, helping them in their wants, securing them toleration from the infidels, or assisting them to find a home in other lands.

The child that was the reward of this pious life was baptized in his infancy. It is noticeable that this, according to the Life, was a difficult and dangerous proceeding. As it is impossible that private baptism can be here meant, for there could be neither difficulty nor danger in that, we must infer that the minister was bold enough to have his child baptized with all the solemnities of the Church. His education was the next concern. His father had higher views for him than to make him a soldier or a hunter; he did not teach him to ride (like an Arab), to throw the spear or shoot the arrow (like the sons of the desert), or to hunt beasts and turn his natural kindness into sanguinary ferocity (like the hunters of the Syrian mountains). And it so happened that he found a tutor for him that left him nothing to desire. One day a band of Saracens brought into the city a troop of captives; whom they were proceeding to sell or to execute. We are told that they had brought them from the "sea-coast," and it is probable, therefore, that they had landed with them at Beyrout after some piratical expedition; for the Saracens began to infest the Mediterranean about 699 or 700. Among these captives was a Greek monk, called Cosmas, who had been brought from Italy (that is, from Calabria, which was full of Greek conventual settlements). His face was grave and beautiful to look upon; his mind, the Life assures us, was still graver

and more beautiful than his face. His fellow captives seemed to have extraordinary veneration for him, for they flung themselves at his feet and begged his prayers. The Saracens, seeing this, asked him what he was. He told them he was nothing but a priest, except a useless monk, and a poor student of philosophy. And as he spoke they saw the tears in his eyes. The father of S. John was present at this scene. He spoke to the monk, and asked him how it was that he, who by his garb was dead to the world, seemed to feel his lot so deeply. The monk's answer reads like a genuine voice of the time, and though it is rather a long one, we must translate it; for it is such utterances that repay the labours of a searcher in the past. The exact words of our Greek biographer, however, need not be scrupulously followed, for much of his version is evidently only what he thinks (erroneously) to be embellishment. The monk replied:—"The loss of this life I do not grieve, for, as you say, I am dead to the world. But my regret is this. I have searched human wisdom from end to end, and have made myself skilled in the circle of the sciences. I have practised my tongue in rhetoric; I have mastered logic and demonstration; in ethics I have learnt all that is delivered by the Stagirite or Aristo's son; arithmetic I know; geometry is familiar to me; I am at home with the rhythms and the harmonies of music; all that concerns the movements of the heavens and the courses of the stars I have carefully studied, that from the greatness and beauty of the creature, I might rise by analogy to the contemplation of the Creator. Then I have penetrated into the mysteries of theology, both the natural theology of the children of the Greeks, and that which is the theme of our Christian writers. And my grief is this. I have studied and learnt, but as yet I have not imparted what I know. I have begotten no children of my mind to rejoice me when I myself must pass away. My talent has been given me by my Master, but I have not delivered it to the bankers. Lo! here it is still laid up in a napkin. I had set my heart upon being reckoned in the number of the faithful servants, and my prayer was that I might give freely what I had received; and because this is denied me, therefore I am filled with sorrow and my eyes run down with tears." This seems a singular speech. But consider the situation. A man, whom a life of long and painful study has made the heir of the civilization and culture of Greek learning and Christian knowledge, stands bound in the hands of barbarians. What strikes him is the "pity of it"—the folly, the waste, that is involved in the ignorant exertion of the brute force that is about to cut

him off! To a thoughtful mind, the Greek monk before the Saracen prince is an image of the whole Greek civilization of that time in presence of the unaccountable brute strength of Islamism. The new power was burning libraries and slaying the men that read them, and the thought that, it seems, may have often filled with sad tears the eyes of the races that had to bow to it, would be one of impotent sorrow that the work of centuries should be erased from the face of the earth, so wilfully, and so wastefully.

In the instance of Cosmas himself, however, that which he lamented was not to be. The father of S. John Damascene listened with much interest to his words, and then resolved that he was the very man he had been longing for to be tutor to his boy. "Forbear, holy man," he said to him, "be of better cheer; for perchance the Lord will give thee the petitions of thy heart." He hastened to the caliph (chronologists have found that it would be either Abdul Melek, or his son Walid) and obtained the captive for himself. Cosmas was instantly made free, and whatever the minister's house contained was placed at his service. The monk set about his grateful task with willing love. Besides his benefactor's son, he had another disciple, a young orphan called Cosmas, like himself, whom the good rich man had adopted in one of his visits to Jerusalem. What the course of their studies was, is sufficiently indicated in the speech of the monk just given. What the progress of the two scholars was, the compiler of the Life finds it difficult to convey. If John was like an eagle cleaving the skies, the young Cosmas was like a ship well laden, with every sail set and the west wind prosperously sending it through the waters. Indeed, it is certain that this first preceptor of S. John Damascene exerted a very great influence over his genius, as we shall see when we come to consider his writings. When the two boys had been trained in all human science and Divine truth, and had progressed so far as to excel (so the monk humbly said), their master himself, Cosmas resigned his charge and retired, with the gifts and blessings of the father, to spend the rest of his days in the laura of S. Sabas, near Jerusalem. Soon afterwards the father also died, and S. John, succeeding to his wealth and honours, was installed by the caliph, though much against his will, in the same post as his father. In the absence of exact certainty as to dates, we may put down these occurrences to the year 720 or thereabouts.

The remainder of S. John's life at Damascus is intimately connected with one important religious and political movement — the Iconoclast heresy. Leo the Isaurian (714-741) was

undoubtedly an energetic and able man. In him the Greeks of the empire found a master who could govern them, and a leader whom they had no choice but to follow. He taught the Arab hosts that were now swarming into Asia Minor, and besieging Constantinople itself, that the Roman power was not yet a mere name, and the bloody defeats which they encountered at his hands staved off for centuries the ruin of the empire of the East. It was about the year 726, when he felt comparatively safe against the Saracens, that he decidedly took part with the new sect of heretics who were attacking the lawfulness of honouring images of Christ and the Saints. The origin of the sect of the Iconoclasts is shrouded in mystery. On the one hand, ecclesiastical writers speak as if one or two evil counsellors, a Syrian renegade, two Jewish soothsayers, and a dissolute bishop, had been the sole instigators of Leo's conduct. On the other hand, it is certain that the Mahometan movement made hostility to all graven things one of its foremost war-cries; and it is not improbable that an imaginary reformation which was so profoundly moving a large portion of the Semitic races may have attracted sympathy among factious or mistaken Christians beyond the reach of the swords of the Saracens. The objects of the emperor in taking it up are somewhat more evident. First of all, he did so in obedience to that spirit of insolent meddling ignorance, that would be laughable had it not been so often serious, which instigated the Greek emperors to assume the settlement of theological questions. But he perhaps had a really deep design in declaring for the Iconoclasts. The worship of images had never yet been the subject of the definition of any Council. It existed in the Church, but an emperor's order might abolish it. Now it was certain that the Saracens, the Jews, perhaps also the Fire-worshippers of Persia, besides the heterodox domestic faction, would all be gratified by the abolition of what they abominated. The power of the empire was still great, and its prestige was greater, and it did not seem an idle dream to hope that a masterful mind might bind together by such a timely move elements that were in dissolution, and even enlarge the boundaries that then were so difficult to hold. It may seem that the question of images was a slight issue on which to ground such a wide conception. But against this two things are evident—first, that the Church has, at some periods and in some places, considered it most important to restrict the use of images; secondly, that the people of the Semitic races, as experience testifies, seemed to oscillate between the two extremes of Iconoclasm and idolatry. As Leo could not hope to reign over an empire of idolaters,

he perhaps took measures to inaugurate an age of Iconoclasts. That his scheme was a total failure we now know. He entirely mistook the character of Islamism. He took the opposition to images to be its very essence ; and he was to be excused in this, for S. John Damascene lays very great stress on it ; but the enthusiastic soldiers of the Crescent were far from being mere heretics. As it was, the success of Iconoclasm consisted in the loss of Italy, and in the division of the East from the West.

The news of the emperor's defection soon reached Damascus, and with it the further intelligence that the worshippers of the images were being burnt in the same fires that were kindled to destroy the images. S. John Damascene took up his pen for the first time, as far as we know, to write for the truth. What he wrote the author of the Life calls "epistolary orations," in which he showed, with much elaboration and learning, that images ought to be honoured. They were addressed to people whom he knew, probably the Church of Constantinople, and he zealously exhorted them to use their own endeavours to spread the truth, to show his letters as widely as possible, and circulate them from hand to hand. It would seem that we have either the very treatises here mentioned, or at any rate their substance, in the "Three Orations against the Opponents of Holy Images." (*Migne*, t. 94.) The first of these orations was written, as we gather from the text itself, as soon as the first news of what had begun at Constantinople reached Damascus, and even before the emperor had deposed S. Germanus the Patriarch. Its date, therefore, must have been about the year 727. It will be interesting to take a glance at a treatise which, together with its two companions, and perhaps some others now lost, have acquired for their author the distinguishing title of the Apostle of Holy Images. They passed from hand to hand in every church from Jerusalem to Constantinople, and, partly by their reasoning, but more by their rallying power over the orthodox multitude, they achieved a success that is best read in the furious anger of the Iconoclast emperor himself. He begins by professing his own unworthiness to open his lips. But "all things are good in season ;" and the Church is now tossed in a furious tempest ; the seamless tunic of Christ is being torn asunder ; His body, that is the word of God and the ancient tradition of the Church, is being cut in pieces ; and he cannot remain silent. One special reason makes him speak. "A weighty thing is the word of a prince to challenge the obedience of his subjects." Experience shows that when an emperor heads a heresy very few are found bold enough to uphold the truth. Therefore,

as one who rides out of the barriers with his horse well in hand, so he lets loose his eager speech :—

For really and truly I have thought it grievous, intolerable, that the Church, with all her glittering prerogatives, with the traditions of the holy men of old, clothing her in perpetual beauty, should go back to needy elements, and fear a fear where there is no fear ; that she, as though she had never known the living God, should dread to fall back again into idol-worship ; that any unworthiness, however slight, should deform her peerless beauty, like a spot upon a fair face. And little things are not little when they are the causes of great ; and it cannot be a little thing to pluck up the ancient tradition of the Church, and to condemn our fathers, whose conversation we are to look upon and whose faith we are to follow.

From the way in which S. John treats the controversy one interesting conclusion is evident. The great argument of the Iconoclasts was the Divine prohibition, in the Old Law, to make images. The Jewish spirit was at the bottom of the whole movement. This the apologist calls going back to “beggarly elements.” After explaining and commenting on the Scripture texts that were commonly quoted, he says, “Such was the Jewish law ; but we, to use the words of the Theologian ” (Gregory Nazianzen)—“we, to whom it is given to have avoided the error of superstition, to have acknowledged the light and to walk purely with God, to serve Him alone and to possess the perfect riches of His knowledge, to have passed out of our childhood and to have met unto a perfect man, we are no longer under a pedagogue ; we have received from God the power and habit of discerning, and we know what an image can express and what it cannot express.” Then, to make the matter clearer, he enters into the explanation of certain terms. What is an Image ? What is Worship (*προσκύνησις*) ? What is Adoration (*λατρεία*) ? This part of the treatise is exceedingly clear and useful to this day ; and, what is more, it is written with a nervousness of language, a precision of thought, and a facile wealth of illustration which are unmistakable proofs of a cultured mind and a practised hand. In his remarks on adoration he is led to speak on a subject which was once hotly debated, but which now is almost devoid of interest. “To worship images was to worship matter ; but matter was evil.” The spirit of the Manichæans was kept up among the least instructed of the population by the influence of such neighbours as the Persian Fire-worshippers, and also by the whole tendency of the ascetical Eastern mind, so prone to fanaticism when not checked by Christianity. And the Paulicians, who renewed



the errors of the Manichæans, were at that moment influential with the Saracens. S. John Damascene grounds his defence of what we may call the æsthetic element in religion, on the great fact of the Incarnation. "God having been seen in the flesh and having conversed with man, I make an image of that which is visible of God (εἰκονίζω Θεοῦ τὸ ὁρώμενον)" . . . . . "What a book is to those who know letters, that an image is to the ignorant; what words are to the ear, that an image is to the sight." . . . "If the Jew was ordered to take twelve stones from the Jordan's bed, and to narrate the cause thereof to his inquiring children, why shall we not express by images the salutary sufferings and the wonders of Christ our God, so that if my son ask me what this means, I may answer that God the Word was made man." There were some, however, who admitted images of Christ or the Mother of God, but refused to allow those of the Saints. "The absurdity! (ᾠ τῆς ἀτοπίας!)," answers S. John. "You are contending, not against the images, but against the Saints. . . . . No! in the story of Christ our Lord and King we cannot leave out the King's army. I worship the image of Christ, as the Incarnate God; of the Theotokos, the Queen of all things, as the Mother of God; of the Saints, as the friends of God, who have resisted sin even to the shedding of their blood, who have imitated Him who shed His blood for them by shedding theirs for Him. Their deeds and their sufferings I express in pictures and put them before me, and I grow holier from the sight, and am strengthened to imitate them. For the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype, as saith the divine Basil." In conclusion, the Saint appeals to the Fathers, and cites a number of passages at length from nearly all the great Fathers of the fourth century. The emphatic way in which he falls back on the tradition of the Fathers must have struck the reader even in the short extracts that have already been given. To him there is no possible appeal from "the tradition of the whole Church, from one extremity of the earth to the other." The appendix of citations must have had extraordinary weight with his readers; they must have confirmed many a waverer and furnished many an orthodox believer with some reason for the faith that was in him. To this day they cannot be read without some emotions of that triumph which must have stirred the monasteries of Constantinople and moved its vast congregations, when the bold and successful vindication began to spread in that city, to which it was specially addressed. Omitting, however, all examination of passages which are hardly S. John Damascene's, let us quote his conclusion, not so much because it is

on the subject as because it gives some additional idea of his genius and style :

If any one sees the image of Christ crucified, and asks, Who is this ? the answer is, Christ the Lord, who took flesh for us. Yes, O Lord, we worship everything that is Thine ! With burning love we clasp to our hearts Thy Godhead, Thy power, Thy goodness, Thy mercy to us, Thy abasement, Thy Incarnation ! We adore Thy flesh, not because it is flesh, but for the Divinity which is joined to it in hypostasis. We adore Thy passion. We do not adore death, nor sufferings : we adore the death of God in the flesh, and His saving sufferings. We adore Thy image, we adore all that is Thine, Thy servants, Thy friends, and, above all, Thy true Mother.

I beseech, therefore, the people of God, the holy nation, to cling to the tradition of the Church. For the gradual abrogation of tradition is like the gradual removal of stones from a house ; the house is sure to fall. God grant that we may all stand firm and unshaken, grounded on the Rock, which is Christ ! to whom is glory, and honour, and worship, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, now and ever, unto infinite ages. Amen.

The second and third Orations contain almost the same matter as the first, with a few changes and explanations. Among the points of interest that these three relics of a controversy of the eighth century offer to the nineteenth, we may mention the following :—

1. The peremptory nature of the apologist's appeal to the tradition and actual practice of the Church. In handling Scripture he chiefly confines himself to the explanation of passages quoted by the heretics. But he frankly confesses that no text of the Bible orders worship to be paid to images, and rests his cause upon the " traditions of the Fathers, whether written or unwritten. For as the Gospel was proclaimed in the whole world, without the aid of writing, so also in the whole world, without writing, hath it been delivered that we should make images of Christ, the Incarnate God, and of His Saints, just as we learn, from the same source, to worship the cross and to pray with our faces to the east." Some passage like this occurs in every paragraph.

2. It is calculated to excite some little surprise that, in advocating the worship of images, he always carefully excepts one case. He will allow no image of the Divinity. To dare to make an icon of the immaterial, bodiless, unseen, unshaped, uncoloured Godhead is to make a lie. But this limitation is more apparent than real. In other places S. John praises the condescension of Holy Scripture in representing the viewless forms of God and of the heavenly spirits under sensible figures. He means nothing more, therefore,

than that an icon, which should profess to be an image of the Divine Nature, *as such*, would be a blasphemous falsehood. This is a truism to us; but, where it stands, it is an interesting relic of an age that recognized the dangers of Anthropomorphism, and feared still the sensuous Pagan fancies of the descendants of the ancient Greeks.\*

3. In the earliest ages of the Church it seems to be admitted that devotion to the Passion of Christ was not prominent. We cannot read the Orations for Holy Images, without being convinced that, by the eighth century at least, there was a great change here. In S. John Damascene the effigy of the cross is the object of worship, and the "salutary sufferings" of Christ are ever before the Christian's eyes. Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre are revered; the lance, the reed, the sponge, "with which the deicide Jews effected the ignominy of my Lord," are touchingly commemorated; and the very object of the devils in stirring up the war against images is said to be to prevent the faithful from having before their eyes the triumphant combats and sufferings of Christ and His Saints.

4. The Blessed Virgin, as might have been expected, holds a place apart in the thoughts of S. John Damascene. The usual title that he gives her, besides that of Theotocos, is "Queen," or "Sovereign Lady," (*Δεσποίνη*). Some of his most striking examples relate to her images. He invariably places her on quite a different footing from the rest of the Saints; first, in making her, as it were, a "class" apart, occupying a place between our Lord and the other Saints; secondly, in applying to her epithets denoting sovereignty; and, thirdly, in joining her with her Divine Son in a peculiarly significant way; as, for instance, when he relates the advice of a holy man to a monk, who was troubled with temptations, "Better to expose yourself to any occasion of that sin, than give up the worship of Jesus Christ and His Mother." And it is a very noteworthy fact that a certain party of the Iconoclasts, whilst rejecting images of the Saints, admitted those of our Blessed Lord *and His Mother*. But we shall have more to say of S. John's relations, with devotion to the B. Virgin, when we come to his Homilies.

5. Some of the keenest and best things in the Apology for Images are the sentences that refer to the imperial patron of Iconoclasm. "It is not for princes to give law to the Church

---

\* "Dei Patris simulacrum nefas est Christiano in templo collocare" is a condemned proposition. See Denzinger, n. 1,182.

(οὐ βασιλέων ἐστὶ νομοθετεῖν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ).” Emperors do not appear in S. Paul’s lists of teachers and doctors. “To the Emperor belongs the administration of the commonwealth; the ruling of the Church, to the pastors and teachers, and the invasion of their right is a *latrocinium*” (a sort of moral burglary; an allusion to the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus). A meddling prince should remember the fate of Saul, of Jezabel, of Herod. “We obey thee, O Emperor, in the things of this world—in tributes, in taxes, in subsidies, in all things in which we are committed to thy care; but in the government of the Church, we have pastors, who have spoken the word to us, and laid down for us the Church’s law. We cannot take up the ancient boundaries that our fathers have set for us; and the tradition which we receive, that we hold fast.”

There can be little doubt that the doings of S. John at Damascus would soon be known to Leo at Constantinople. It was to the latter city, indeed, that his letters were addressed. Leo was a determined man, not a mere crowned grammarian, like some of his predecessors and successors. The story of his revenge on S. John Damascene, though not confirmed by sufficient evidence, is quite possible, and perhaps would be admitted by all to be quite probable, except in one or two of the details. Damascus was out of the Emperor’s power, and the Caliph’s first Minister was not likely to have much to fear from a Court that could only with difficulty hold its own on the Bosphorus. Under these circumstances, we are told, Leo had recourse to a perfectly Greek piece of perfidy. His agents, “putting on the mask of piety,” mixed with the faithful, among whom S. John’s letters were passing from hand to hand, and by dint of great exertion, got hold of an autograph of the writer. The manuscript was given to the Emperor’s notaries, who studied it until they could perfectly imitate, not merely the characters, but the thought and the style. He then ordered them (“for,” says the Life, “he did find persons to obey him in this”) to indite a letter to himself from S. John. It was an invitation to the Emperor to come and occupy Damascus, which, he assured him, a rapid and secret movement of a sufficient number of troops would effect with the greatest ease; “and I myself will help you to good purpose, for the whole place is in my own hand.” This epistle was despatched to the Saracen Caliph, with another in Leo’s own name. “Anxious to preserve the inestimable blessings of peace and friendship,” he says, “I have ever striven to the best of my power to observe the treaties I have made with your Serenity; notwithstanding that I am continually urged by a certain Christian among your subjects, who is always sending me letters, to

march on Damascus, and possess myself of it. Wherefore, to show you what man I am, how truthful and how faithful, and also to let you know what he is, I send you a sample of these letters, written in his own hand." Both these documents reached the Saracen prince in safety. S. John was summoned before him, and, to his wonder, read the treason under what seemed even to himself to be his own handwriting. He saw the plot; its diabolical ingenuity struck him; but he stoutly and earnestly protested his innocence. But the "enemy of Christ," the Caliph, at once believed it all. He would not listen to a defence ("like the ass and the lyre," as the Life remarks), would not give him a moment to disprove the accusation, but instantly ordered him to lose his right hand, "being out of himself and mad with rage." The sentence was executed, "and the hand that had reproved the enemies of God was stained, no longer with ink, as when writing for holy images, but with its own blood." And the hand was hung up in one of the principal squares of Damascus.

The sequel of the narrative is the part which critics regard with the greatest suspicion. But it shall be given. On the evening of the same day, when it was to be expected that the wrath of the Caliph would have cooled down, S. John sent messengers to him to beg that his hand might be restored to him; and the reason they were instructed to give was, that as long as the hand remained unburied, he suffered intolerable pain. The Saracen prince acceded "at once" to his prayer. On receiving the severed member, he retired to the oratory of his own house, and, "prostrating his whole body before an image of the Mother of God, he joined the hand to the part from which it had been divided, and, with sighs and tears, prayed thus from the very bottom of his heart":—

Lady ! Queen ! All-holy Mother !  
 Christ my God was born of thee !  
 In thy cause and for thy image  
 This right hand was lost to me.

Why the Lion raged and ravened  
 Thou in heaven above dost know ;  
 Help me, Lady ! heal me quickly,  
 Here before thee lying low !

Wonders oft at thy sweet pleading  
 Hath thy Son vouchsafed before ;  
 Heal my hand and let it praise Him—  
 Thee and Him for evermore !

Of His Faith and of thy honour  
 Still the champion let it be !  
 What thou askest thou obtainest ;  
 Christ my God was born of thee !

Praying thus, sleep overcame him, and in his sleep he saw the holy image turn its eyes upon him, full of compassion, and he heard it say, "Behold, thy hand is whole ; henceforward continue to do as thou hast promised." He awoke healed, and, rising up, he sang one of his hymns in thanksgiving. Then, calling his family around him, he spent with them the remainder of the night in thanking God. The rejoicings were heard by those who dwelt near, and the news, spreading through the city, soon reached the Caliph. S. John was summoned and questioned. He showed his right hand ; it bore no trace of the knife, save that a thin red line ran round the wrist. The Caliph was astonished and convinced. He asked his pardon, confirmed him in his office, even giving him, it would seem, a higher rank, and proclaimed that he would never do anything without consulting him.

But the Saint had done with Damascus and with worldly matters. He used his new-found favour with his prince to bid adieu to him for ever. The Caliph, with great difficulty, allowed him to go. He stripped himself of the whole of his great wealth, and made it over to the poor and the captive. Then, turning his back on the beautiful city of his birth, he travelled the road that S. Paul had come, over the low barren hills through Galilee, along the valley of the Jordan, and so over the Samaritan mountains to Jerusalem. After adoring our Lord in the holy places of His passion, he entered the great laura of S. Sabas.

About midway between Jerusalem and the northern end of the Dead Sea, that is about 12 miles from each, the traveller comes upon one of the most curious scenes in the Holy Land. The region is wild and rocky. The eye, ranging southward and eastward from the Mount of Olives, sees what seems at a distance to be a tossed sea of barren hills, what the Bible calls "a horrible desert, a dry and howling wilderness." The traveller who tries to make his way to the banks of the sea that bounds this land of desolation, finds it "pathless and waterless," as David described it, and climbs out of one *wady* to cross a ridge, and descend into another. Perhaps he tries to follow the valley of the Kedron, which is the largest and the easiest to travel. Towards evening his guides will stop at the gateway of a house in the wilderness—or rather of an irregular collection of square turrets, clinging walls, buttresses, little windows, and domes, that seem to have been sprinkled by a freak of



nature on the face of the frowning rocks, rather than to have been built up there by human art. It is the convent of Mar Saba, the oldest in Palestine. There S. Sabas lived, and thence he ruled all the lauras of the valley of the Kedron. In a gallery of the rock they still show you the cave which he took from a lion, and the spring that he obtained by his prayers. All round about, for miles and miles, the hills are honeycombed with rocky chambers, the deserted dwellings of the thousands of monks that peopled the wilderness, where David hid himself, and where a greater than David was tempted by the Devil. Two, three, sometimes four stories of cells pierce the sides of the valleys, overhang the precipices, or bury themselves below the level of the ground. The buildings that now stand, the fine church with its dome and its tombs of saints, the hospice of pilgrims, the libraries, and the rest, are of various dates and styles. In appearance, as well as in its associations, Mar Saba is to Palestine what Mount Athos is to Greece, or Monte Cassino to Italy. Twenty or thirty monks still inhabit it, to open their gates to pilgrims, and to keep a pious guard over a region that has been sanctified by the lives of thousands of saints, and consecrated by the blood of innumerable martyrs, from the days of the Saracens down to the last outrages of the Arabs in 1832. It was hither that S. John Damascene retired, to fast, to labour, to repeat the Psalms, to read Holy Scripture, to obey, and to save his soul, like one of the many hundreds that filled those mournful solitudes with silent life. The cell he inhabited is still shown—an ordinary rocky chamber, high up on the brow of the ridge; pious devotion has turned it into a chapel, and adorned its walls with pictures, whose style of art is said to be below what would have seemed due to the great defender of holy images. Here he lived and wrote. In this cloister he received priest's orders, and it is not certain that he ever left it again. The rest of his life has hardly any events but his writings. We read how he was given to a novice-master to be trained, how he was sent to Damascus to sell baskets on the very scene of his former greatness, how he wrote poetry and was reprovèd for it, how by miraculous admonition he was ordered to use his gifts for the service of the Church, and how he wrote and preached. Little more remains, therefore, now that his active work in the world has been somewhat amply described, than to form an estimate of those literary labours by which he is best known to posterity.

After his fame as a defender of images, S. John's memory chiefly lives by his celebrated work, *De Fide Orthodoxâ*. He is mentioned in manuals and compendiums as the Father of

Dogmatic Theology, or sometimes of Scholastic Theology, and his claim to the title is founded on this treatise. We need not here inquire in what sense it can justly claim either of these titles ; but it will be interesting to take it up, and see what it is like.

The first noticeable thing about the treatise is the fact that it is not an isolated work, but forms part of what may be called a trilogy. In a preface, whose style recalls the piety and warmth of the Orations on Images, but which is distinguished from them by the writer's consciousness of his monastic profession, he dedicates to Cosmas, his foster-brother and schoolfellow, who had become a monk with himself, and was now Bishop of Maiüma, a work which we know, from other sources, should be called *Ἡ Πήγη Γνώσεως*, or the *Fountain of Science*. He explains that it is in three parts. The first part treats of Dialectics or Logic ; the second is a summary of heresies ; and the third, a compendium of the doctrines of the Faith.

The Dialectics alone would suffice to place the name of our Saint among the remarkable names of Christian science. It is not much more, certainly, than a rather meagre compendium of Aristotle and Porphyry. But it is the first example of the application of the Aristotelian terminology to the purposes of Catholic theology. Greek philosophy had, indeed, often come in contact with Catholic dogma before the monk of S. Sabas wrote about Essence and Nature in his bare cell in the wilderness. But in the Alexandrian schools, and their offshoots, it was Plato, and not Aristotle, who had been brought face to face with Jesus Christ. The spirit of Plato is not the spirit of science and scientific form, but of tempting vagueness and wide theorizing. It was not possible, therefore, that Plato, with all his magnificence, should ever lend his help to make a *science* of the Church's faith. Again, the great Fathers of the fourth century, especially S. Athanasius, had written volumes on the Catholic treatment of such particular terms as Nature, Substance, and Person ; but they had not consciously used Aristotle, perhaps had not used him at all. The consequence was, when S. John wrote, that there was an existing Catholic terminology, not drawn from any philosopher of Greece, but forged by the labours of many champions of the Faith. It was not copious, but it was there. It was a new thing, therefore, to re-write Aristotle's Logic, and adapt it to the recognized speech of the Church. It was a new thing to introduce the principle that the Aristotelian theory and terminology was so true as to be capable of being used in systematizing revealed truth. It was so new

that we may well excuse the very small advances made in S. John's work towards a complete development of what it was capable of. It was so new that he himself seems half afraid of the power he has called up, and sometimes nominally vilifies what he virtually makes use of. His distinction between *οὐσία* and *φύσις* is an example. He blames the distinction of the philosopher, and praises that of the Fathers, which, in reality, come to precisely the same thing. But he avows his plan in words that might serve for a text to the *Summa* of S. Thomas. "Every artificer," he says, in the first chapter of the *Dialectics*, "requires certain instruments, with which to do his work; and a queen should have handmaids for her service." The science of Theology was to use the labours of the greatest of Greek philosophers as an instrument, and the terms of Gentile wisdom were to be the queen of the sciences. We have, indeed, in this unpretending handbook the fountain of a mighty river. And it grows more interesting when we remember its date. By the first half of the eighth century learning was very low in the Greek empire. Theology had ceased to be creative; and in philosophy even commentators on Aristotle had grown few in the land. It was a hundred years since Maximus the Abbot had fought Monothelism, and Sophronius of Jerusalem had seconded him in words not unworthy of the era of Gregory Nazianzen. It was nearly two hundred since John Philoponus had made his name as an Aristotelian commentator, amid the wreck of falling Alexandria. Since then there had been stillness and death. The West had been more active than the East. Venerable Bede (735) had just closed his life of encyclopædic labour. And perhaps the schools of Cassiodorus, in Southern Italy, still kept up their former learned activity. Indeed, it seems not improbable that S. John Damascene was considerably indebted to Western sources for his own culture. Cosmas, his tutor, was a Greek monk from Italy. If he came from Calabria, which is nearly certain, and from the colony founded by Cassiodorus, which is highly probable, then the resemblance between the *Dialectic* of S. John and the sketch in the treatise *On the Liberal Arts*, of the Roman statesman and cenobite, may be more than community of origin. If S. John, through his tutor, had inspirations from a Roman source, like Venerable Bede,—if the Aristotelianism and wide culture introduced into the Roman schools by Boethius, and upon which the training of the Calabrian monks was conducted, were led captive across the Great Sea, and rescued in the market-place of Damascus, in the person of Cosmas, then both the encyclopædic promises of the monk's speech and the

similar character of S. John's learning may be traced at least to one fountain-head. On the whole, if the Dialectic is slight and unpretending, yet it discovers, in its small compass, a boldness of conception and straightforward realization of a novel situation, which makes us look back to it with a kindly love, and willingly give it, in its isolation, a higher place than for its matter, perhaps, it deserves.

The brief treatise *Περὶ Αἱρέσεων*, which is a sort of dictionary containing a summary account of more than a hundred heresies, may be passed over, as offering little that is interesting, excepting, perhaps, the article on Mahometanism, which is more curious for the fact of its putting Mahomet among the heretics than for what it says about him.

We come now, therefore, to the celebrated book, the *Ἐκδωσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Πίστewς*, that is, the "Accurate Exposition of the Orthodox Faith;" in Latin usually cited as *De Fide Orthodoxā*. The author's own account of it is as follows:—"Then" (that is, after the history of the heresies) "I will set forth, by God's grace, the truth, the error-killing and lie-destroying truth, that the inspired prophets, the fishermen taught of God, and the sainted pastors and doctors have adorned with their words as with the golden fringes of the Psalmist; for its glory, which is from within, will shine out and enlighten all those who approach with purged eyes and pure hearts. Of mine own, as I have said, there will be nothing; but I will collect together, to the best of my power, the things that have been elaborated by the most discerning doctors, and will set them forth in compendious phrase." There could not be a more accurate description of the *De Fide Orthodoxā*. Some idea of its proportions may be formed by saying that it would occupy perhaps a hundred pages of this review. It has been divided, partly, it would appear, by the author, but partly also by modern recension, into one hundred chapters, each containing one or more distinct subjects. The division into four books seems not to have been made by S. John, and there is no such marked division of the matter as would warrant it. The contents are, briefly, God, the Trinity, creation, man and his nature, and the Incarnation; these are treated at some length, more especially the Incarnation, which occupies one-third of the entire work. Then follow, in single chapters, the Holy Eucharist, the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, Virginity, Antichrist, and several other useful matters. The qualities required for an undertaking like this are, reading, accuracy, clearness, and nervous vigour of diction. The reading alone necessary to make the work what its author intended, a sort of tessellated reproduction of

the words of the Fathers, would be a proof that in the library of the rock-cloisters of S. Sabas there were preserved many precious manuscripts of the great writers of the Church, and many, also, of others that are now unknown, but whom the monks of that day knew and read. It is not improbable that there exist to this day on the same spot manuscripts that must have been there when S. John wrote this work. The monks are shy of showing all their treasures to strangers, for they have been plundered more than once by those who should have known better. But report speaks of manuscripts of the fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries still existing there, the work of the monks of the laura. In 1806 and 1834, when some search was made on the spot, among other manuscripts were found no less than 380 works of the Fathers, besides books of Aristotle, Hippocrates, Libanius, and others, and an Uncial Codex of the eighth or ninth century, perhaps written under S. John's own eye. Tischendorf, in 1859, found three Palimpsests, in addition to others already discovered. And besides the Greek treasures there are manuscripts in Arabic and Syriac, in Russian and Wallachian, and some splendid Abyssinian parchments. That S. John's library was here there can be no doubt; and the continual references to authors that garnish the foot of his pages is a proof how well he has used them. Still, although he has performed the humbler office of a collector, there is room for many of his own words. And it is in this work that many will think his eloquence is at its best. When his matter allows him, as in his Homilies, and even in his Orations on Images, he often, it must be confessed, runs into the rhapsodic and exclamatory style which the grammarians call Asiatic eloquence. But here his subject has put a rein upon his fervour; he has condensed the vapour of his enthusiasm into a cold but sparkling flow of science, and the result proves to be a didactic style of a very high order. As this can only be proved by specimens, and as few readers are likely to be acquainted with the work itself, a few extracts may be here inserted, translated as literally as tolerable English will allow. And first to give a brief sample of his handling of philosophical topics:—

#### THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

A second proof. If man is never the author of his actions, the power that he has of *deliberating* is to no purpose; for why should he deliberate, if he can never be master of any action of his, all deliberation being directed to action? But to affirm that the finest and highest of man's powers is useless, is absurd. If, therefore, he deliberates, it is in order to an action; for all deliberation is in order to action and on account of action.

Next let us take a theological extract from the most developed part of the work, the account of the Incarnation :—

#### AGAINST THE MONOPHYSITES.

The two natures (in Christ) were united to each other without change or alteration ; so that neither did the Divine nature lose its own simplicity, nor was the human nature either converted into the Divine or reduced to annihilation, nor, in fine, was one compound nature formed out of the two. For a compound nature can be consubstantial with neither of the two natures out of which it is compounded, but is a new thing out of two other things. For example : the body, which is composed of the four elements, is not the same substance as fire, nor is it called fire ; neither is it called air, water, or earth, not being of the same substance as any one of them. If then, as the heretics say, Christ, after the union, becomes a single compound nature, He undergoes change from the simple to the compound, and so is consubstantial neither with His Father, who is simple, nor with His Mother, who is not compounded of divinity and humanity. He cannot be in Godhead, and he cannot be in manhood ; He cannot be called God, He cannot be called man ; He can only be called Christ, and “Christ” will not denominate the person, but, according to the heretics, the new nature. . . . But how can one and the same nature be capable of substantial differences that are mutually repugnant ? How can the same nature be at once created and increated, mortal and immortal, finite and infinite ?

Our next extract shall be a sample of what we may call moral theory ; it is S. John’s introduction to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Eucharist :—

#### FALLEN MAN AND THE INCARNATE GOD.

He had given us His own image and His own Spirit, but we had lost them. He took upon Himself, therefore, our poor and weak nature, that He might purify us and make us once more incorrupt and so render us partakers of His Divinity. But it was meet that not only the first fruits of mankind should become partakers of this *summum bonum*, but that every man that pleased should be born of a second birth, and should be nourished with a food that was new and fitting for this new life, and so should arrive at perfection. Wherefore, by his own Birth (or Incarnation), and Baptism, and Passion, and Resurrection, He has freed our nature from our first parents’ sin, and from death and corruption ; and becoming the first fruits of the resurrection, He has constituted Himself the way, the rule, and the example, that we, following His footsteps, may become by adoption what He is by nature, sons and heirs of God and co-heirs with Himself. Therefore He has given us, as I said, a second birth, that as by being born of Adam we became like to Adam, and inherited his curse and corruption, so, being born of Him, we might become like to Him and might inherit His incorruption and blessing and glory. But this second Adam was spiritual, and so it was necessary that the Birth and the Food should be spiritual. Wherefore,



Birth is given to us by water and the Spirit, I mean, by Holy Baptism ; and the Food is the very Bread of Life, Jesus Christ, who came down from Heaven.

Our last example shall be—

#### HOLY COMMUNION IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

Wherefore, with all fear and with a pure conscience and with faith not doubting, let us approach ; and as we believe, nothing hesitating, so it shall be to us. Let us honour it with all purity, of soul and of body ; for it is twofold. Let us approach with burning desire, and with our hands composed cross-wise, let us receive the Body that was crucified ; then, applying it to our eyes, our lips, and our forehead, let us receive it ; that the fire of our love, flaming up at the contact of this “ burning coal ” of the Prophet, may burn up our sins and illuminate our hearts, and that by this Divine fire we may become both inflamed and divine.

These extracts will serve to give some idea of the style of the *De Fide Orthodoxâ*. They will also, perhaps, have suggested that the work is rather an antiquarian curiosity than useful or suggestive reading. Every work, however, must be considered with a view to the time and circumstances of its production. And had we been a student in the theological schools of the Mediterranean city of Maiuma, when Cosmas, the Bishop, received his first copy of the *Fountain of Science*, our sentence would certainly have been very different. We should have found we had a manual of “ positive theology ; ” we should have found the questions of the day, that is to say, the disputes about the Incarnation, clearly and copiously set forth, with a very special reference to the newest authority out—who, to be sure, was not very new, as he happened to be Maximus of Constantinople, who had been dead about ninety years.\* We should have met a certain amount of philosophic treatment, a good deal of it rather novel. We should have gained a sharp, clear, and short text, on which to hang our Scriptural and Patristic reading. And we should have seen, and perhaps appreciated, the shadows of certain great questions, just projected on the margin of our text-book, and vaguely suggesting some of those thoughts and speculations that make dogmatic theology an ever-living and growing science.

---

\* It must not be supposed that S. John Damascene ignored the sixth General Council (680) ; but in the first place he never expressly quotes any Council in the *De Fide Orthodoxâ*, and indeed seldom quotes any of the Fathers *by name* ; and in the second, the words of the Council do occur several times in his text.

But the *De Fide Orthodoxâ* has had an immortality conferred upon it quite independent of its intrinsic merits. It became the text-book of the great scholastics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was already known in Europe in the Latin version of Burgundio of Pisa, when Peter Lombard made it his own. The *Summa* of S. Thomas, growing up on the plan of Peter Lombard, grew up on the plan of S. John Damascene, as any one may see by comparing the two works; and if the Angelic Doctor wanted a citation from the Eastern Church, it was pretty sure to be S. John Damascene who supplied him with it. For to the middle ages his work was, what it really is, the result of all the elaborate processes that had been going on in Greek theological speculation during the seven centuries which saw the best, or indeed, the whole, of her intellectual life.

The remainder of the works of S. John Damascene have neither the importance nor the celebrity of those we have been considering; but there are none of them that are not interesting monuments of a period that is very badly represented in literature. For instance, the argument *against the Jacobites* or Monophysites, a pamphlet of 60 or 70 pages, written probably at Damascus, introduces us to the deadly strife that was at that time agitating nearly every city of Asia, Syria, and Egypt, and which even the yoke of the Saracen did not extinguish or abate. It also reminds us of Leontius, ex-lawyer of Constantinople, and monk of S. Sabas, whose voluminous writings against the same heretics S. John certainly saw before he wrote his own book, and to consult which, he may probably have visited S. Sabas, before he came to live there as a monk. His *Dialogue against the Manichæans* reminds us that in his own days, as has been before remarked, the Paulicians renewed the old errors about the intrinsic evil of matter, and the good and bad principles, with their never-failing corollaries of practical antinomianism and licentiousness. These pestilent teachers made their appearance not very far from Damascus, and they certainly possessed the ear of the Caliphs of Damascus during the time that S. John lived; for we read that Peter, Bishop of Damascus, had his tongue cut out by Walid II. for opposing them. The dialogue is remarkable as containing an exceedingly clear statement of the negative nature of evil, and for a very effective grappling with a subject which had been a sore puzzle to many Christian writers. It is interesting to remember that one of the feats of S. Thomas was the scientific exposure of Manichæism, which was as troublesome in his days, under the patronage of the Albigenses and Waldenses, as it had been five hundred

years before. The *Disputation between a Christian and a Saracen* seems to be, in its present state, the notes of some advice that S. John had given as to what one was to "say" to a Saracen when he made his usual objections against Christianity. There is a note in one version, in which a "Saracen" is represented as struck dumb with admiration, and departing without a word to reply. It may have been so when S. John Damascene disputed; but arguments about the Incarnation and Free-will seem singularly insufficient to have stopped the armies of the Moslems. Yet this disputation seems to show that, in S. John's lifetime, the Saracens were not so utterly separated in thought, feeling, and habit from the Christians, as to be considered out of the pale of a controversy grounded on principles mutually admitted. Several other opuscula, whose nature is sufficiently indicated by their titles, and by what has been said, show the important part which our Saint took in the instruction of the Church in his day. The two immense collections of Scriptural and Patristic citations, partly under the name of Commentaries, and partly of *Sacred Parallels*, furnish some insight into the way in which he must have prepared himself for testifying the tradition of the Fathers.

The Homilies of S. John Damascene take us back, more vividly than any of his writings, to the scenes in which he passed the latter part of his life. Many of those that are extant—indeed, we may say all of them—were pronounced outside the precincts of his own laura, after the dignity of the priesthood and the commands of his abbot had given him the right to preach and to teach. Most of them were delivered in Jerusalem itself; one at least in the Church of the Transfiguration, on Mount Thabor. Their principal themes are the passion of Our Lord, and the praises of Mary, His Mother. They take us back to crowded churches and fervent vigils, at the end of Lent, when "fasting has ended in the Cross." Their pomp of language and careful preparation bespeak a solemn occasion; bishops are present, and frequently the solemnity is of the very highest rank. Here is an extract from

#### A GOOD FRIDAY SERMON IN THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

It is the Day of the Cross! We all rejoice, and fast from evil, and are pure within and without. Look abroad over the whole earth and consider the regions, the cities, the places, the nations, the islands, the rivers, the shores, the races, the tribes, and the unknown tracts of the Barbarians; and see how many are everywhere fasting to-day for the sake of the Cross, crucifying their vices, and letting the night pass on without remitting their abstinence. We are assembled to hear about the Cross, and we fill the

church, and we crowd upon each other, sweating and labouring: men accustomed to the first seats upon the bench of justice, are here willingly standing for Jesus' sake, because Jesus stood for us. What was done to-day? For this day's wonders must not be lightly passed by.

And so the sermon proceeds to narrate the events of the Passion. These sermons have all the fire and sweetness of S. Bernard. But S. Bernard himself never wrote anything more fervent and more full of fluent praise than the Homilies on our Blessed Lady. We have here the very luxuriance and unchecked wealth of encomiastic piety. No Neapolitan peasant ever poured out his petitions to Mary before his wayside image with half the ingenuity of redoubled supplication with which the Greek saint begs her intercession for every class and interest of the Church of God. No fervent heart has ever written down more beautiful litanies than those in which, with the thousand times repeated *χαῖρε!* this man learned in the Scriptures gathers from every source associations to her name. No warm-hearted nun ever pressed Mary's image to her lips with more tenderness than this cultured and strong-minded man pours out over the tomb of her whom he calls his Queen the mingled sorrow and gladness excited in his heart by her glorious sleep. But there is no need to quote him here, for his words about the Holy Virgin are the only ones that can be said to be familiar to us out of all that he wrote. They ought to be more familiar still, for they are not only a mine of devotional wealth, but, if we are not mistaken, the examination of their phraseology is calculated to throw much light upon the dogmatic bearings of devotion to Mary.

To complete the conception of S. John Damascene that is here diffidently offered to the reader, we must remember that he is the most celebrated liturgical hymnologist and musician of the Greek Church. Unfortunately, we are obliged to take this part of his reputation almost entirely upon trust; but we need not hesitate to do so. What remains of his hymnography is not much, and consists wholly of iambics on the Life of Christ. They have a sweet solemnity in them that recalls the introverted meditation of the poetry of S. Ambrose. But they cannot be more than the faintest representation of what he really wrote. Cosmas, his teacher, professed to be a skilled poet and musician. The legendary account of the miracle at Damascus speaks of "his own hymns" as part of his usual prayer. At S. Sabas we read that Cosmas, his foster-brother, was his associate and his follower in "his labours in spiritual canticles," and "in providing the Church with harmonious chants *in citharâ et voce psalmi.*" Another ac-

count speaks of his canticles and sweet melodies, and compares him to the nightingale, the turtle, and the dove. It was our Blessed Lady herself who ordered him, when a monk, to exercise his talent in singing the praises of her Son. He and Cosmas are mentioned, in the *Menologium* of the Greek Church, as celebrated for their hymns and songs for festival days; and Cedrenus relates that they both had the surname of Μελωδός, or the Singer, because "they had set to music the hymns that are sung in the churches." Suidas says that their "regular melodies" (ᾠματικοὶ κανόνες—the phrase probably means "poems," but perhaps "chants") have never been equalled, and will never be surpassed. The *Menæa* (4th December) call him a "lyre breathed on by the wind," "a shepherd's pipe,"—one who "pleases the ear and the mind at once, and exhilarates all orders of the Church by his honeyed utterances." . . . "O John, most wise Father, thou hast rejoiced the Church of Christ with thy inspired songs, O greatest of singers, striking thy harp by the impulse of the Spirit, imitating the arch-harmonist, David, with whose melody thou hast charmed the ears of all." The laura of S. Sabas was a liturgical centre from the very days of its founder. The liturgy established by the holy abbot himself was restored, after the first burst of the Saracenic invasion, by Sophronius of Jerusalem, so often mentioned, and it was in this reformation and recension of liturgical books that S. John and Cosmas seem to have borne such a conspicuous part, by writing hymns, composing and arranging chants, editing, or perhaps composing, all those brief narratives of Saints' lives that form what the Greeks call their *Synaxaria*,—the nearest counterpart to the lections of the Western breviary, and furnishing great additions to that large collection of poetical prose which, under the name of the *Menologium* and the *Menæa*, makes up such a considerable part of the Greek offices, and which is, perhaps, more familiar to many readers now than it was, by the citations from it in Dom Guéranger's liturgical works.

S. John Damascene was called by his immediate posterity Chrysorrhoas, or the Golden Stream. It was the name of one of the rivers that gladden with their bounteous waters his native Damascus. Perhaps his countrymen were the more inclined to give him a name of honour because there was no one either immediately before him or after him to dispute his pre-eminence. As the last of the Greek Fathers, he summed up their teaching and sealed it with his testimony. The fate of his book "On the Faith" has been like the fate of that Greek theological literature of which it is the abstract. Greek

theology was a bright flame, and then it seemed extinguished, and then in the fifteenth century it began again to influence dogmatic speculation; and now in our days we find in it a treasure-house of manifold instruction and piety. So the book of S. John. When the desolation of the East came, it went down into a cavern, even as did the sacred fire that the Hebrews hid away when they went into captivity. But in happier days it was brought out again, and when the sun shone, when it was once more in the light of the Church of Christ, though in a different land, it blazed up as of old, and was found to be living as ever. For it was the pioneer of Greek theology in the West, and if we honour that magnificent literature that is every day yielding up greater discoveries to the intellectual methods of the West, and in subjection to the unerring canon of the Roman Church, we may spare some slight tribute of interest for the life, the endurance, and the work of S. John Damascene.

---

---

#### ART. IV.—CATHOLIC CONTROVERSIES.

*L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre. Discours prononcé au Congrès Catholique de Malines.* Par le COMTE DE MONTALEMBERT. Paris : Douniol ; Didier.

*L'Erreur libre dans l'Etat libre.* Par M. LE COMTE DE BEAULIEU. Paris : Palme.

*Pensées de M. Louis Veuillot.* Paris : Poussielgue.

THERE is perhaps no note of the Church which in these days is so striking, arresting, and influential, as her unity of faith. Nothing indeed is more natural and easy, than that unity of religious opinion should exist among populations, in which no active thought whatever is exercised on things *relating* to religion. But the subduing phenomenon presented by the Catholic Church is, that Catholics do think persistently and keenly on things relating to religion, and yet preserve their characteristic and proverbial unity of faith. There is no other phenomenon at all like this in the world; and it stands out as a greater marvel in these days than in any others, because the world has now had such bitter experience of “the all-corroding, all-dissolving scepticism,” generated externally to the Church by inquiries into religious truth.\*

---

\* The words within inverted commas are from F. Newman's “Apologia,” p. 379. We should add the explanation which he subjoins, and which bears



We can thoroughly understand then—nay, we heartily sympathize with—a feeling which has prejudiced some Catholics against various propositions earnestly maintained from time to time in this REVIEW. There are some who feel very strongly against doctrinal controversies between Catholic and Catholic. Of course nothing is more easily intelligible to every one, than that as there are certain closed questions on one hand, so there are certain open ones on the other; certain questions on which, by the consent of all, all are free to differ. The Catholic's obligation of accepting revealed truths is but placed in a clearer light, by his full liberty of thinking for himself on matters unconnected with Revelation. But what perplexes some Catholics is this,—that we have treated various questions in the DUBLIN REVIEW as most certainly not open, and yet not as absolutely closed. We have not represented them as "absolutely closed"; for we have admitted that he who takes what we account the non-Catholic view of them, does not thereby cease to be a Catholic. Yet still less have we represented these questions as open; because we have maintained that he who takes the erroneous view commits (materially at least) in some cases grave imperfection, in others mortal sin. We have not denied, e. g., that Gallicans are Catholics; yet we have insisted that those follow far more loyally and generously the Church's teaching, who hold Roman infallibility to have been taught by the

---

entirely on our context. "I have no intention at all to deny that truth is the real object of our reason, and that, if it does not attain to truth, either the premiss or the process is in fault; but I am not speaking of right reason, but of reason as it acts in fact and concretely in fallen man [in the very large majority of instances]. I know that even the unaided reason, when correctly exercised, leads to a belief in God, in the immortality of the soul, and in a future retribution; but I am considering it actually and historically; and in this point of view, I do not think I am wrong in saying that its tendency is towards a simple unbelief in matters of religion. No truth, however sacred, can stand against it, in the long run; and hence it is that in the pagan world, when our Lord came, the last traces of the religious knowledge of former times were all but disappearing from those portions of the world in which the intellect had been active and had had a career. And in these latter days, in like manner, outside the Catholic Church things are tending, with far greater rapidity than in that old time, from the circumstances of the age, to atheism in one shape or other. What a scene, what a prospect, does the whole of Europe present at this day! and not only Europe, but every government and every civilization through the world, which is under the influence of the European mind! Especially, for it most concerns us, how sorrowful, in the view of religion, even taken in its most elementary, most attenuated form, is the spectacle presented to us by the educated intellect of England, France, and Germany!" (pp. 379, 380).

Apostles. Again, without doubting that "liberal Catholics" have a right to the name of "Catholic" which they assume, we have spoken of their doctrine with much severity. We have argued (1) that they directly contradict the doctrine of the "Mirari vos;" and (2) that absolute and unreserved submission of intellect to that doctrine, as to the Church's infallible teaching, is obligatory (if they did but know this fact) under mortal sin. Here is the perplexity which some Catholics feel. They understand what is meant by close questions, and what is meant by open questions; but they cannot for the life of them understand this intermediate class. They understand a Catholic controverting with Protestants "*tanquam pro aris et focis*;" and they understand him controverting with Catholics, so long as he admits that his opponents have as much right to their opinions as he to his own. What they do *not* understand is, his denouncing certain tenets as sinful, which are avowedly held by some of his brother Catholics. As we have already said, we heartily sympathize with the feeling which leads to this perplexity. On various occasions we have incidentally referred to it; and now again we are induced by circumstances to make a few further remarks on the subject.

The first and most obvious remark on it is, that at all events the inquiry is one of fact; and that it must surely be susceptible of very easy determination. If we have followed the Church's teaching, we have been right; if we have gone against her teaching, we have been wrong. Now, without speaking here of her earlier ages, it is obvious on the surface, that, from the time when she began her practice of pronouncing *minor censures*, she has ipso facto placed various questions in that very position which generates the perplexity. Take one instance out of a thousand. She has denounced certain propositions of Fénélon as censurable, but not as precisely heretical. Let it be supposed then that some English Catholics at the present day were knowingly and avowedly to advocate those condemned propositions. An orthodox opponent must not of course argue against these misbelievers in any tone which should imply that they have as much right to their opinions as he has to his: for so to argue, would be to betray the Church's cause. And yet he must admit these very misbelievers—unless they further maintain some *heretical* tenet—to be his fellow-Catholics; to be members of the Visible Church; to be included in the unity of the Faith. They have not denied anything which the Church teaches *as an integral portion of the Faith*; though they have denied that which she teaches *infallibly* and as of

*strict obligation.* They sin mortally against the virtue of faith, but they are not heretics.

This particular case is of course purely imaginary, though most easily supposable. But the "Liberal Catholics" are a really existing body of men. Now no one who reads the "Mirari vos" with any attention, can doubt that they deny the doctrine which it teaches. And no one who acquaints himself with the circumstances accompanying that Encyclical, can doubt that Gregory XVI. quite as distinctly testified its *ex cathedrâ* and infallible character, as Innocent XII. ever testified the *ex cathedrâ* and infallible character of the Brief which condemned Fénélon. But no Catholic would hesitate to denounce severely Fénélon's tenets, after their condemnation: why then should he use less severe terms, concerning the tenets of "Liberal Catholics"? Rather such language is *more* called for in the latter case than in the former: because no Catholic in these days is tempted to Quietism, but multitudes are more or less consciously imbued with the poison of religious Liberalism. Nor again is it easily possible, that any severity of invective which we can use shall exceed that employed by Gregory XVI. himself in his Encyclical.

From all this it really follows, that it is our opponents and not ourselves who are seen on the very surface to be in a false position. If there are Catholics who think that no tenets are worthy of denunciation except those which are actually heretical,—these men run directly counter to the Church's teaching. If there are Catholics who would recommend their religion to Protestants, by alleging that no intellectual subjection is due from children of the Church, except only to the Faith itself,—these Catholics, however excellent their intention, are simply endeavouring to kidnap converts under false pretences.

The course however which we have ourselves pursued, may be censured in a somewhat different indictment. It may be urged that, though undoubtedly children of the Church sometimes hold unsound and censurable opinions, a Catholic writer should not publish any attack on such men; that he should content himself with privately appealing to his diocesan or to the Holy See. Otherwise, so it is urged, the Church's internal peace is grievously disturbed, charity violated, ecclesiastical authority set at naught.

Now firstly, let us draw out, by one or two examples, what this would come to in practice. Let us e.g. make the supposition already suggested; viz., that a school of writers arose, building their tenets on Fénélon's condemned system.

It is alleged, in effect, that we should have no business to make any comment on this in the DUBLIN REVIEW; and that by making such comment, we should not merely transgress our legitimate province, but act disrespectfully to ecclesiastical authority. For Fénelon's tenets, be it again observed, were never condemned as *heretical*. Let us take another instance. F. Newman considers ("Apologia," p. 401) that there is "a violent ultra party" in the Church, "which exalts opinions into dogmas, and has it principally at heart to destroy every school of thought but its own:" in other words, a party which claims untruly the Church's authority for its own private opinions. We are not ourselves aware of any persons who seem to us guilty of this intolerable presumption; but if such dull tyranny do exist, surely it should be steadily discountenanced and opposed by loyal Catholics. This was indeed undoubtedly F. Newman's purpose. He did not intend for a moment to say, that such men have as much right to their opinion as he to his. On the contrary, he wished to appeal against them to Catholic public opinion, on the very ground that their course is opposed to the Church's real teaching. The allegation then would be, that F. Newman, in so expressing himself, acted disrespectfully to ecclesiastical authority; that if he had any complaint to make, his proper course was a private appeal to his bishop or to the Holy See; that the tendency of what he did was merely to promote disunion and schism within the Church's peaceful bosom.

Such is the allegation which we are now to consider, viewed in its practical applications. We should only add, that a subdued version of it has been at times apparently implied. It has been implied that a Catholic may indeed legitimately publish against such errors; but only if he will strictly confine himself to the form of a theological treatise, and to the language of ecclesiastical Latin.

Now to this whole allegation, as to the first which we mentioned, the obvious reply is that of facts. It is quite easily *imaginable*, that the Church shall have branded indeed certain tenets with minor censures; but that she shall also have prohibited or discouraged her individual children from publishing any protest against those errors. We are only to inquire whether *in fact* she has either prohibited or discouraged this. But a multiplicity of facts prove that she has done the very contrary. From the vast number which occur to our mind, we will select one in particular; because it bears on that tenet of "Liberal Catholicism," concerning which, more perhaps than concerning any other, we have been thought to employ schismatical and overbearing language. We have always

expressed indeed, and that most sincerely, hearty respect for the zeal which has been exhibited by this party, and a profound sense of the great services they have in various ways rendered the Church. At the same time we have advanced the very direct and intelligible proposition, that their characteristic tenet, as "*Liberal Catholics*," is point-blank opposed to the Church's teaching. Our opinion on this head is shared by M. de Beaulieu. M. de Montalembert delivered an oration at Malines in the year 1863, which we have named at the head of this article, and which we can only characterize as deeply deplorable. He published this under his favourite title, "*L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre*." And the very title as well as the contents of M. de Beaulieu's volume, which we have also named at the head of our article,—"*L'Erreur libre dans l'Etat libre*,"—shows that it was intended as a reply to the oration. This volume was written in the vernacular; and was very far less like a theological treatise, than have been our own articles on kindred subjects. Now here is a crucial instance; for M. de Beaulieu did that very thing, which our critics say that no Catholic has a right to do. The question at issue then is simply this:—Did the Church's supreme ruler approve his course, or disapprove it? The Holy Father would not leave this matter in doubt; for he commanded a warm letter of praise to be sent to M. de Beaulieu, in his name. We have already printed a translation of this letter; but it is so much to our present purpose, that we will once more place it before our readers.

Most Illustrious Sir,

Although most weighty cares concerning the whole Church allow no leisure for reading to our Most Holy Lord, Pius IX., yet he could not but cast his eyes on the book you sent him, and skim, at least, over some portion of its contents. For he thought that you had undertaken most opportunely to detect and refute an error which has long since been deeply implanted in the minds of many of the faithful; viz., their thinking that the present evils of human society are attributable to the depravity or ignorance of men, rather than to the fault of those principles which are accepted at this day; and of supposing that order and peace are to be restored at length, if all men, and the Church herself, favouring the age's progress, embrace and assert the boasted liberties. But, from that small part of your book which he has been able rather to glance at than to read, he has observed, not without pleasure, that it excellently corresponds to the title prefixed, and shows that all the efforts of those who so think tend to this result, although against their will, that there be only introduced the freedom of error and the Church's consequent oppression. And, chiefly, it pleased him that, in order to repel error, you had derived your arms from the very Chair of truth, and had called to mind those things which Gregory XVI., of sacred memory, had

taught on this subject ; and which, if they had been received as they should have been, would have removed all dissension and reason for doubting. But some men think that humble submission should indeed be rendered to documents of the Holy See when they treat of religion, of discipline, of morals ; but not equally when the question concerns the civil government of society : [and these men, therefore,] have chosen rather to follow their own bent [*proprio ingenio*], [than to accept the decision of the Holy See] ; as though such government were not subject to the laws of virtue and to the teaching of morals ; and as though the best method of governing peoples were not delivered in Scripture, of which the Church is interpreter. Would that your work may accomplish what it has not been hitherto possible fully to achieve, and that they may see themselves to be in the wrong when they proclaim those things as in themselves approvable and useful, and contend for them as ends to be advanced, which the condition of events and force of circumstances recommend as endurable for the avoidance of more grievous evils. Let them understand that, if the rights of truth and error be placed on a level, it must necessarily happen, from men's innate proclivity [to evil,] that the latter will grow strong and the former be oppressed. Let them weigh those pernicious consequences of their doctrine, from which their pious mind recoils ; and which, although dissembled or reprobated by them, by pressure of logical force can in no way be prevented. Lastly, let them advert to the detriment inflicted by them on the Church's cause, which, being on every side assailed with so great violence and [such dangerous] machinations, demands union of minds and opinions, and claims from Catholics that they should, as it were in a phalanx, rush with one accord against the common foe ; but which is compelled to mourn over division of opinion, sometimes the severing of hearts, and the bluntness or even unfitness of those arms which are used against the enemy. Our Holy Father would desire these men to think of such things while they read your book ; and he congratulates you because you have contributed labour and thought to the dispelling prejudices and recalling wandering minds to the path of truth. And, while he augurs for you a most copious fruit of the labour you have undertaken by God's help, he very lovingly imparts to you his Apostolic Benediction as a pledge of God's blessing and of his own fatherly good will.

Having expressed this according to the office entrusted me, I rejoice to testify to you my own peculiar esteem and respect, praying from God for you all things happy and salutary.—Most illustrious Sir,

Your most devoted and obedient Servant,

FRANCISCO MERCURELLI,  
S. Dm. S. ab litteris latinis.

Rome, Oct. 22, 1864.

In this letter Pius IX. expressly refers to the great evils which accrue to the Church from disunion “ of minds and opinions,” and from the consequent powerlessness of Catholics to “ rush with one accord against the common foe.” But he lays the blame of this disunion, not on those Catholics who publish against the theological errors of other Catholics, but the



very contrary ; he lays all the blame on those who *advocate* such errors. He warmly praises M. de Beaulieu for attacking the "liberal Catholics" ; and especially for his doing so on *theological grounds* ; for his appealing against his opponents to "the very Chair of truth," and "to those things which Gregory XVI. had taught on this subject" : adding that Gregory XVI.'s pronouncements, "*if they had been received as they should have been*," would have removed all dissension and reason for doubting."

Similar in tendency is the Holy Father's Letter concerning M. Veuillot, which we mentioned in our last number, p. 226. Abbé Charbonnel has put together a volume of extracts from that great writer's works, which we have named at the head of this article ; and the Holy Father congratulates him on his "useful undertaking." "Those whose occupations preclude them from studying all" M. Veuillot's "numerous works, have the advantage in your work," says Pius IX., "of finding themselves provided . . . with the solid arguments he has so frequently furnished . . . for exposing the fallacy of the opinions *with which it is now sought to undermine the religious foundations of society.*" This clause refers, of course, to M. Veuillot's repeated assaults on "Liberal Catholicism." Now what is the language which M. Veuillot uses concerning that system ? Is it language which implies that the "Liberal Catholics" have as much right to their opinions as he to his ? Our readers shall judge from two extracts.

Certain statesmen have wished to prove that philosophism, heresy with its sects, and Catholicity can live tranquilly side by side, peaceably taking each other by the hand. . . . Those who so speak . . . desire . . . to set *those cold Catholics* still more profoundly to sleep, who know not what great principles are placed under the protection of their holy religion (pp. 370, 371).

I do not say that the "Liberal Catholics" are heretics. For this it would be necessary first of all that they should intend so to be. As to many of them, I affirm the contrary ; of the rest I know nothing, and it is no business of mine to judge them. The Church will pronounce, if there is occasion, when the time shall come. But whatever be their virtues and good intentions, I believe that they *are bringing in upon us* heresy, and one of the most pronounced (*carrées*) heresies ever seen. "Liberal Catholicism" and the spirit of the world are closely allied (pp. 372, 373).

Then look at the "*Civiltà Cattolica.*" In July, 1866, we translated at length Pius IX.'s Brief in its favour ; which testifies, among other things, that that periodical "is held in the greatest value by all good and right-thinking men." Now there has been no more salient characteristic of the "*Civiltà*"

from the first, than its repeated denunciation of the unsound views, whether philosophical or politico-religious, advanced by various Catholics, in opposition to the decisions of ecclesiastical authority. Never does it speak of such questions as open ones ; but on the contrary, reprehends the delinquents in terms of severe censure. Its discussions are all in the vernacular ; they are not certainly, more than our own, in the form of theological treatises ; and their authorship is always anonymous.

To prevent possible confusion, let us here recapitulate our argument so far as it has gone. It is admitted of course by all, that there are various most fundamental controversies between Catholics and externs. And it is admitted by all, that there are certain legitimate controversies between Catholic and Catholic ; viz., those in which the advocate of either side admits that his opponents have as much right to their opinion as he to his. We will call these “ *open Catholic controversies*.” But there is a vague though very natural impression among some Catholics, that the case is quite otherwise with what we may call *aggressive Catholic controversies* : we mean those, in which the advocate of one side maintains that his opponents, though not ceasing to be Catholics, transgress the Church’s teaching ; and that they are in some cases even guilty (materially at least) of mortal sin. There is an impression, we say, among several Catholics, that these “ *aggressive Catholic controversies* ” are not legitimate. But we pointed out that the fact indubitably is as we allege ; that the Church *has* condemned various errors and required their renouncement under pain of mortal sin, without condemning them as *heresies*. In answer to this it is sometimes implied, that, at all events, individual Catholics have no business to controvert such tenets publicly ; or at least not otherwise than by Latin theological treatises. And we have now been rejoining that, on the contrary, the Pope has warmly praised those who have done this very thing : that he has warmly praised those who have denounced the non-heretical errors condemned by him ; and who have denounced them in vernacular essays, addressed to the public opinion of educated Catholics. We, of the DUBLIN REVIEW, have but followed—as it is always our one highest ambition to follow—the very path traced out for Catholic journalists by the Holy Father himself.

The allegation however, against which we are contending, may take a third and still more moderate shape. At all events, it may be said, nothing should be said in censure of any tenet, until the Church has expressly condemned it. In

this shape the allegation would have no force against ourselves. We have never once, we believe, inveighed against any tenet as theologically unsound, on a mere appeal to what may be called the Church's unwritten magisterium; never, except on the ground of such tenet having been condemned in effect by the Church's expressed determinations. Still we cannot admit the allegation, even in this shape. Consider, e. g., the early heresies—Arianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism. Zealous Catholics, in inferior place, begin by inveighing against them as contradictory to the Faith, and by invoking the intervention of supreme authority. And the Holy See, while condemning the heresy, has in such cases always heartily praised those, who denounced it *before* its condemnation. Or, for a later period of history, look at the controversy "de auxiliis." What could be more severe than the accusations on either side? Molinists were assailed for holding a doctrine hardly distinguishable from Pelagianism; while they in turn denounced their opponents, as advocating what was little better than Calvinism in disguise. The Pontiff finally declined to give any immediate judgment, and required each party to abstain from censuring the other until the Holy See should put forth a decision; but neither party was blamed for their *previous* mutual recriminations. It may be added also, that these very controversies, though at the time apparently fruitless, yet did the Church invaluable service; since they accumulated to her hands much highly important material, for the judgment which she had so soon afterwards to pronounce on the Jansenistic heresy. Or turn to the contest between Bossuet and Fénelon. From a very early period it was referred to Rome, and Fénelon professed his firm resolve of submitting unreservedly to her decision. Yet none the less, while waiting for that decision, both parties appealed diligently to the opinion, not of theologians so much as of educated Catholics in general: for among the innumerable publications which followed in most rapid succession, we believe that by far the larger part were in the vernacular. The issue, meanwhile, was most grave. Bossuet indulged in vernacular invectives, not only against the "Maximes des Saints" but against its author, which were not entirely to his own honour; while Fénelon, to the end of his life, maintained that Bossuet's doctrine on charity was, by necessary consequence, subversive of Catholic dogma. We have heard something lately about theological treatises and a learned language, as being the only permissible media for such a controversy; but certainly no such idea was known in the time and country of Bossuet and Fénelon. Or lastly, we might cross the Channel, and look at the vernacular con-

troversies between Milner and Charles Butler; but that to exhibit these sufficiently would carry us much too far.

Now, in all that we have said, we do not of course for a moment defend any violence, uncharitableness, or intemperance of language, whether in arguing against unsound Catholics or externs: though doubtless, from human frailty, instances may easily enough be found of such faults, among excellently intentioned men. Nor again do we for a moment deny that individuals, in bringing doctrinal accusations against their fellow-Catholics, are bound to act with all due deference to ecclesiastical authority, with all due deliberation, and with all due self-mistrust. Nor lastly do we undervalue—extremely far from it—the very great evils which accrue to the Church, from a spirit of contentiousness; from the fostering of division among Catholics on questions which are really open. We only say, that there is nothing *of itself* un-Catholic, in public writers bringing gravely and dispassionately a charge of theological unsoundness against persons whom they may admit nevertheless to be their brethren in the Faith.

The difficulty, which we are meeting throughout, may be thus expressed. “These aggressive Catholic controversies must be most undesirable and indefensible, because they obscure and disparage that unity of faith, which is nowadays the Church’s most conspicuous and influential badge.” We have been hitherto engaged in pointing out that, while the Church indubitably lays extreme stress on her unity of faith as on one of her very chiefest notes, she, no less indubitably, encourages Catholic controversies. She approves and encourages, we say, controversies, carried on against those Catholics who may advocate errors which she has condemned. These two different principles of action, we infer, cannot possibly be inconsistent with each other, because the Church avows them both. It remains then to show *how* they are mutually consistent; and a very little consideration will enable us to exhibit this with perfect clearness.

The Church places before all her children a large body of dogma, originally taught by the Apostles, which she has sedulously preserved. This covers a vast extent of ground, concerning such matters as the numerical Unity of God’s Nature, the Blessed Trinity, Creation, Original Sin, the Incarnation, Transubstantiation, the gifts of grace, &c. &c. These dogmata are so profound, so solid, so mutually consistent, that the noblest science in the world is occupied entirely, on the one hand in analyzing them, on the other hand in harmonizing

them with each other and with reason and experience. Again, in proportion as they are pondered and meditated on, they produce an unique and unparalleled effect on the interior life; imbue it with a peculiar and most elevated character; give incredible assistance to growth in sanctity. Nor is this effect at all confined to those, who are sufficiently instructed for mastering those dogmata one by one: any Catholic may obtain for himself in his measure their due moral influence, by opening his heart fully to the Church's practical teaching, and unreservedly surrendering himself to her most wholesome atmosphere. As to any contradiction of these dogmata, this is not heard of through the length and breadth of the Church; nor indeed ever has been, unless in those exceptional times and places, where the Church has been in the agony (if we may so express ourselves) of ejecting some heresy from her bosom. All Catholics have this body of dogma in greater or less degree brought before them; and are, at all events, exempted from all teaching of every kind contradictory thereto. At the same time it must be admitted that there may be, and in fact is, great inequality in different parts of the Church, as to the completeness, distinctness, effectiveness, with which Catholic dogmata are apprehended. This inequality arises partly from the greater or less reverence which is paid in any given local church, to Rome the mother and mistress of all. And it arises partly from another circumstance, closely connected with the former; viz. the religious errors, short of heresy, which may have been permitted to grow up in that local church.

All this is true, whatever else is true; and it is surely a most broad and pregnant fact, on which Catholics do right to expatiate emphatically. But further, this fact is not only not obscured, but rather is placed in clearer and fuller light, by those "aggressive Catholic controversies" which are our present subject.

Let it be understood therefore firstly, that the Church's undivided solicitude is for the Faith and the salvation of souls; and that otherwise she cares not a jot either about philosophy or politics. But there are many philosophical and politico-religious propositions, which are most perilous to the Faith; either as leading by legitimate consequence to its partial rejection, or else in the way of less direct antagonism. Those whose mind is imbued with such errors, will in the long run (looking at them as a school) cease to hold the Faith itself in simplicity and purity. Some few, as time goes on, will openly apostatize; the rest (speaking generally) will have a most unworthy and insufficient apprehension of the Faith. It

is true indeed, that even if the Church's infallibility extended no further than to her testification of revealed verities, such infallibility would be a vast blessing to mankind. But it is a far greater blessing still, that, by her power of infallibly condemning errors which are *not* heresies, she can take measures so unspeakably more effective than would otherwise be possible, for presenting revealed verities to her children in their full integrity and significance.

From the doctrine thus set forth, as to the Church's attitude towards those errors which are not heresies, a consequence follows which at times has not been sufficiently observed. The Church detests non-heretical errors, not on their own account, but so far as they tend to heresy or the loss of souls. If some *heresy* is making progress in any corner of the Church, it is the Pontiff's indispensable duty to crush it and put it down ; and it was precisely for failing in this duty, that Honorius after his death incurred the Church's anathema. Again no person, whom the Pontiff knows to have advocated *heretical* tenets, can be recognized by him as a member of the Visible Church. But neither of these two propositions is applicable to those errors, which may have been infallibly condemned indeed, but not as heresies. Such errors, as we have said, are detested by the Church, not for their own sake but as perilous to the Faith. Now it is evident that, under very numerous imaginable circumstances, greater injury might accrue to the Faith from publicly denouncing them, than from letting them alone : and in such cases the Pontiff will of course remain passive.

It may be worth while to give an illustration of this, to make clear both the meaning and the importance of our remark. Nothing can be well more certain, than that the Bull "*Unam sanctam*" is an infallible doctrinal pronouncement. Suarez speaks of it as "*manifest*" that the Bull has been so "*received and approved by the common consent of the Catholic Church.*" Cappellari, afterwards Gregory XVI., implies as his own opinion that the same Bull "*has, for more than four centuries, served as a rule to the Catholic universe.*" See our number for October, 1867, p. 349. But what would have been the result if, in England e. g. at the beginning of this century, the reigning Pope had pronounced an express censure, on all who did not hold the doctrine contained in the "*Unam sanctam*" ? Of course, the progress of the Faith would have been indefinitely more injured by such a course, than by the toleration of those non-heretical errors which the Bull had infallibly condemned. On such occasions—and they are extremely numerous—other means are open to the Church,



distinct from that of direct censure, for gradually bringing back greater purity and integrity of Catholic doctrine. We will mention one such means in particular; because of its singular prominence and importance, and because it has been so peculiarly efficacious in Catholic England. A more pronounced, earnest, pervasive devotion to our Blessed Lady has a most profound effect—an effect, perhaps, possessed by no other devotion to the same extent—in dispelling the spirit of worldliness, and in giving a new and deeper quality to the love of God and of her Son. Now there is no surer corrective of doctrinal error, than increased unworldliness and love of God. Nor has any circumstance, we believe, more conduced to that marked doctrinal advancement of English Catholics in late years, which is so conspicuous to the most superficial observer, than the vastly greater prominence given by them to the worship of Mary. It is a pleasure to testify, how much the Church is indebted for this to the true and genuine Catholic spirit of our late Cardinal.

We are now enabled to answer an argument, on which some, to our surprise, have laid stress. How can it be acceptable to the Holy Father, it has been asked, that Catholic writers should treat with severity the tenets e. g. of “Liberal Catholicism,” when he has not himself denounced, by name, any one member of the school; but on the contrary grants them in effect full toleration? Now “Liberal Catholicism” is avowedly no heresy; and the Pontiff therefore is under no obligation of promptly expelling it from the Church, as though it *were* one. He earnestly desires its extirpation, because of the injury which it does to the Faith and to salvation of souls. But it is evidently most imaginable, that a certain *means* of extirpating it might inflict on souls far greater injury, than they now receive from its continued presence in the Church. We argued in Jan. 1868 (pp. 129-130), as for a fact visible even to ordinary observers, that far more harm than good would be done, by the pronouncement of any direct censure on individual “Liberal Catholics”; though of course the one ultimate and competent judge of expediency is the Holy Father himself. One thing at all events is most certain; viz. that he draws the very distinction, which these objectors allege he cannot possibly draw. For on the one hand he pronounced no direct censure on M. de Montalembert’s Malines oration; while on the other hand he warmly praised M. de Beaulieu, for denouncing that oration on theological grounds.

No difficulty now remains, in replying to the general objection which has been raised against our course. It has been

alleged, in various shapes, that by the very fact of engaging in these aggressive Catholic controversies, we show ourselves to be less zealous for the one Faith common to all Catholics, than do those who protest against such controversies. We reply generally that the *presumption* is all the other way; because it is exclusively *for the sake of the Faith*, that the Church pronounces her minor judgments at all. Those who are most zealous against condemned non-heretical error, are *presumably* just those who are most zealous for the Faith; who earnestly desire that it should be accepted, not speculatively alone, but practically; that it should not be otiosely professed as an assemblage of naked dogmata, but earnestly and fully apprehended in its length, breadth, and depth.

The general objection, however, assumes several different shapes; and we may usefully consider it in those shapes.

Thus firstly it is thought, that that great note of the Church, her unity of faith, is less prominently and emphatically exhibited to non-Catholics, in consequence of these aggressive controversies. But it is no paradox to say that the reverse rather holds good. For in the first place, both those who engage in such controversies, and those who deprecate them, alike exhibit to the world that one Faith, which is common to all Catholics, as the central and paramount object of their concern. And secondly, the unrelenting vigour with which such controversies are carried on, proves unmistakeably one fact, which is extremely momentous as an evidence of the Church's supernatural and soul-subduing power. The vehemence of controversy, we say, proves unmistakeably, that the Church's unity of faith is not obtained—as unity of doctrinal opinion is maintained among schismatics and barbarians—by means of religious stagnation and of indifference to doctrinal truth; but on the contrary is preserved intact, amidst the most energetic and unresting intellectual activity exercised on things religious. Now this is the one particular, in which the Church's doctrinal unity stands in broad contrast with that of the Photians e.g. or Mahometans: and it is an invaluable service therefore, that it be exhibited in its full light before the whole world.

Secondly it is objected, that non-Catholics are repelled from seeking admission into the true fold, by Catholics so greatly enlarging the number of credenda. But of course the question is one of *truth*. No one would consciously recommend what we have already called the kidnapping of converts under false pretences. Those who seek admission should be made acquainted with the exact truth, neither more nor less. But even as a matter of expediency, we wonder there can be a

second opinion. You catch a convert, by assuring him that if he will only submit his intellect to certain definitions of faith, on everything else he will be at liberty to think just as he pleases. He exercises his imaginary freedom, and some fine morning finds himself on the Index. Such delusive representations are but an unfailing recipe for the manufacture of sullen and disloyal Catholics; of Catholics who, instead of exulting in the happy yoke under which they are placed, are ever chafing and fretting under its pressure. Far better surely that they had remained for a longer season external to the Church, than that they should form a knot of malcontents within her bosom. She claims to be her children's one safe and trustworthy guide to heaven; and until a person is prepared so to accept her, his proper place is elsewhere.

Thirdly the same objection may be pressed, but in a somewhat different shape. "You need not *deny*, in your language to Protestants, the extent of intellectual submission required from Catholics; but you should *keep it in the background*, as one which non-Catholics will probably misunderstand. On becoming members of the Church, they will ere long view in its true colours, from *within*, a truth which would have been greatly repulsive to them, if contemplated from *without*. But these noisy aggressive controversies force this truth on their attention, at a time when its effect is most prejudicial." Well, but even if it were *desirable* to keep back part of the Church's doctrine from expected converts, how could such a "disciplina arcani" nowadays be possibly practised? How is a doctrine to be so stored up, as to be on the one hand available for the Church's children, and yet on the other hand hidden from externs?

However, we think it on the contrary of great importance, and we do not hesitate to say so, that non-Catholics should clearly understand the full amount of intellectual submission claimed from a Catholic. We urged this a year or so ago; and as we need not take the trouble of finding new words for an old thought, we will repeat what we then said. Our reason then is this. Individualism, or private judgment, was involved as a principle in Protestantism from the first; yet only by slow degrees has it been carried into practical effect. For some two centuries the religion of Protestants, with certain rare exceptions, was a corporate religion. In several parts of Europe latterly that truly anti-Christian maxim prevailed, "*cujus est regio ejus et religio*;" but everywhere religion was corporate. Lutheran, Calvinistic, Zuinglian, Socinian societies differed from the Catholic Church on certain prominent tenets; and the recog-

nized office of private judgment was to examine the foundation of these respective tenets. This task once performed, the inquirer united himself to one or other of these societies, as the case might be, and adopted "en masse," as a matter of course, the whole remaining assemblage of its doctrines and practices. That was the proper period for Catholic "Eirenica." Under such circumstances as then existed, it is plain that every wise and charitable Catholic controversialist would adapt himself to this universal habit of Protestants; he would content himself if, by any means consistent with honesty, he could prevail on them to enter the Church. It might be counted on with confidence, that if they once became Catholics, they would submit themselves without hesitation to the Church's whole body of formal and of practical teaching.

It is very evident how totally different is the present attitude of educated and thinking Protestants, and what vast strides have been made in practically applying the principle of individualism. None are perhaps so profoundly imbued with this principle, as those who call themselves Unionists. They seek union with the Roman Catholic Church, in the express intention of setting her magisterium at defiance; in the express intention of explaining away her definitions, into accordance with their own private judgment. It would be a great calamity to the Church, that men thus minded should effect an entrance within her pale. Are you prepared, we ask them, to enter her communion, not as critics and judges, but as humble disciples? Are you prepared to comport yourselves as men who now for the first time are to learn the full truth?—as men who are to learn it, by regulating your interior life according to the rules and counsels which she will place before you, and by unreservedly surrendering yourselves to her moral and spiritual atmosphere? If you are so prepared, heartily and joyfully will her priests open to you her gates. If you are not so prepared, and until you are so prepared,—your ignorance may probably enough be invincible—but your proper place is without and not within. To become Catholics, is to live as it were in the atmosphere of authority; to look for direction at every moment towards the Church and the Vicar of Christ. And we consider that we have rendered important service both to the Church and to yourselves, by enlarging on the vast extent of that intellectual submission which she peremptorily claims at your hands. Unless you rightly apprehend this, you will start with assuming a fundamentally false position; and it may become more or less a matter of accident, whether you ever become loyal Catholics at all.

In fact, we have of late seen quite an abnormal and incredible instance of this. Mr. Ffoulkes has recently described the state of mind under which he first professed to accept Catholicity. What can be a greater doctrinal scandal, than that for so many years he should have appeared externally as a member of the Church?

Fourthly, we are accused of wantonly and inexcusably disturbing the Church's peace. Who accuses us of this? We trust (for their own sake) not those who themselves hold tenets which the Church has condemned. To take a previous illustration, suppose some Catholic were avowedly to advocate an ascetical system, based on Fénelon's condemned propositions. These propositions were not condemned as heretical; and their upholder therefore does not, as such, cease to be a Catholic. His orthodox fellow-Catholics, however, indignantly denounce his views; and he thereupon turns round on them, and declaims against their wanton disturbance of the Church's peace. Would not this, we ask, be the very sublime of impudence? Whether truth or peace be accounted the greater good, at all events this imaginary offender would have grievously injured both truth *and* peace. In like manner, to take another case (which unhappily does not resemble the former in being entirely imaginary), it is surely not a *defender* of the "Mirari vos" but its assailants the "Liberal Catholics,"—who are chiefly responsible, for whatever ecclesiastical excitement their intellectual rebellion may have provoked.

However, we fully admit that orthodox, no less than unorthodox, Catholics commit a grave offence, when they cause any wanton and unnecessary internal disturbance in the Church. No other question indeed is possible, except as to what particular disturbance *is* wanton and unnecessary. The conflict is undying between the interests of truth and the interests of peace; and in no particular case can individuals, we think, trust *their own* judgment, as to whether of the two should predominate. For ourselves we have often frankly admitted, that the mere fact of some given doctrine having been infallibly determined by the Church, is no defence in itself for bringing it publicly forward at some particular time. We refer exclusively, of course, to determinations which are not definitions of faith. And as to the public advocacy of any particular doctrine thus infallibly determined, a writer, we have always said, is bound to consider, not truth only but expediency; he is bound to consider, not merely whether the Church has marked it once with the perpetual seal of her infallibility, but whether at this moment she desires it to be brought forward. We should never, e.g., have ventured to insist publicly on the

Church's indirect temporal power—though no exposition can be more unmistakeable than is contained in the "*Unam sanctam*"—had not Pius IX., in condemning the 24th error of the Syllabus and in other ways also, drawn attention to the doctrine in question. It cannot be a wanton and unnecessary disturbance of the Church's peace, to dwell on a doctrine which the reigning Pontiff has himself pressed on the notice of his children.

At the same time we must urge what seems to us indubitable; viz., that the whole objection about disturbing the Church's peace, as commonly urged, proceeds on a complete mistake, as to the kind or at least the degree of peace, which Christ intended for His Church. He conferred on her, and secured for her, unity of faith and government; but we do not see that He gave her reason for expecting freedom from very great and frequent internal discord. This is a consideration which it is of such great importance rightly to apprehend, that we will proceed to dwell on it in some detail.

Take e.g. her necessary efforts for extirpating heresy itself: how disastrous and long-lived are the contentions which thus originate! We are not referring to the heretics themselves—though the struggle with *them* should not be forgotten—but rather to that great mass of half-hearted and undiscerning Catholics, who are not themselves heretical, but who are not quick to see heresy in others: men of whom John of Antioch, in the Nestorian contest, may be taken as a representative specimen. As particular instances of what we mean, look back at the Church's conflict with Eutychianism, and again with Jansenism: what deep and prevailing animosities and disturbances through large portions of the Church accompanied these conflicts throughout! How very far was the Church from enjoying internal peace and concord!\* Turn to another particular. Consider the contentions and bitterness which have arisen again and again, as time went on, from the open disobedience of great potentates against ecclesiastical authority; or again from the dogged and sullen resistance to that authority, maintained by men either openly wicked or worldly at heart; or lastly from the innumerable conflicts between the respective tendencies of Catholic unity and of national independence. As one instance out of a thousand, study the whole historical scene of which S. Thomas of Canterbury was the centre. In these cases there is often no question of doctrine: the rebellion

---

\* Some very striking remarks, on the phenomena exhibited in the Church's dealings with these heresies, were made by F. Newman in his work on "*Anglican Difficulties*," pp. 258-267.



is against the Church governing, not teaching. Or look at a widely different class of circumstances again. See how much disunion is caused, among men perfectly orthodox, by great difference of opinion on matters of policy. We see one very far from extreme instance, in looking at facts of the moment. Certain most orthodox persons have wished that young Catholics should undergo examination at Oxford and Cambridge: others, we trust not less orthodox, hold that nothing could be more disastrous than this; that it would be far better there should be no Catholic higher education at all. Undoubtedly in this instance one side has expressed its view with exemplary gentleness and moderation of tone; and we hope that the other side also has not exhibited any faulty violence. But who does not see, that there is just as much danger in this case, as in a case of *doctrinal* discussion, that (through human infirmity and sinfulness) mutual harshness and discord should ensue? We are really inclined to think, that, among the innumerable contentions which have characterized every period of the Church's course, a very small comparative portion indeed has arisen from doctrinal opposition to non-heretical error.

Surely indeed there is no more promise that the Church shall be exempt from keen internal conflict, than that she shall be exempt, as regards her children, from sin and imperfection. Let self-abnegation, unselfish zeal for God's glory, large-mindedness, docility, grow with miraculous rapidity among Catholics,—in that proportion, indubitably, there will be very far fewer aggressive controversies. But this result would ensue, not because the points at issue in these controversies would come to be thought less important, but just the contrary; because opposition to any part of the Church's teaching would be so much rarer, and would tend to be unheard of among her children.

Lastly it is objected, that such matters should be reserved for the theological schools; and that there is nothing in them which concerns the laity. Here a distinction is to be drawn. What could be more preposterous than to say, that it is a matter of indifference to Catholic laymen, whether they are or are not at liberty to advocate "liberty of conscience" as a positive good? as a positive advance in civilization? M. de Montalembert and M. de Falloux would protest against such an allegation as heartily as we should protest against it ourselves. So as to any philosophical tenet on which the Church has spoken: is it not a question which profoundly affects laymen, whether they are or are not bound to accept her decision on such tenet with interior assent? It is a matter for

ever increasing amazement, how assertions of this kind can ever have been made. Certainly, if ever there were a matter on which a Catholic public writer is bound to speak—with which every educated Catholic layman is intimately concerned—it is the obligation of assenting to the Church's judgment on things primarily philosophical or political.

It is quite imaginable, undoubtedly, that the Catholics of some given country fully recognize the obligation of accepting these judgments with firm interior assent, but that they do not care to inquire which of their number are strictly infallible. We have more than once expressly admitted (see, e. g., Oct. 1867, p. 333) that had this been the case in England, it would have been quite indefensible on our part to intrude on their notice theological discussions about infallibility. We have expressly admitted that, on such a supposition, the controversy on the extent of infallibility should have been reserved for the theological schools. But facts were directly the other way. A constantly increasing number of educated Catholics took for granted, that those judgments (though they should not be spoken against) were altogether to be ignored; and that Catholic speculation was to proceed irrespectively of their instruction. Yet the Holy Father expressly declared in the "*Quantâ curâ*," that he had condemned "the chief errors of our most unhappy age in many Encyclicals, Allocutions, and other Apostolic Letters"; and it was eminently to the teaching of such Allocutions and Apostolic Letters, that these thinkers disavowed all obligation of firm interior assent. It cannot be a small matter, that various "chief errors of this our most unhappy age" should be embraced by children of the Church. And the evil would of course have become greater and greater, in proportion as higher education should make further advance among Catholics, without this particular mischief being corrected. If any one will explain to us, how we could have laboured with any success against the mischief in question, otherwise than by introducing these discussions about infallibility,—we will listen carefully to his suggestion. We only say that we could not and cannot think of any other possible means. But our sole wish in the matter has been, that those various ecclesiastical judgments, which are not definitions of faith and which pronounce on matters primarily philosophical or political, should receive that firm interior assent which is their due.

Here, in conclusion, we must digress a little from the general drift of our argument, to explain what has just now been said. We must speak of the firm assent due from every

Catholic to those doctrinal instructions officially sanctioned by the Holy Father, which are either not certainly infallible, or are even certainly not infallible. An obvious and prominent example of the last case is afforded, by those doctrinal decrees of a Pontifical Congregation, which are not in such sense made his own by the Pontiff himself as to be pronouncements *ex cathedrâ*. Concerning these non-infallible decrees—Pius IX. expressly teaches in the Munich Brief, that perfect “*adhesion towards revealed truths*” cannot be obtained, unless “men of science submit themselves to” the said decrees: and the whole course of proceeding at Rome invariably implies, that firm interior assent to them is due from every Catholic. We have often illustrated the nature of this assent, by referring to a youth of fourteen years old, instructed by a father (whose character he has every reason for respecting,) in the facts and principles of history. He accepts the whole instruction with unreserved assent, nor does the very thought of its being erroneous in any one particular so much as enter his mind; and yet he knows that it is not infallible. But the reasons for firm assent in the case before us are far stronger than in that which we have given as parallel. The endemic and pervasive tradition of the local Roman Church is really infallible; and from that Church all other churches, as Pius IX. declares, are to derive their doctrine. But of that tradition the various officials of the Pontifical Congregations, acting as they always do under the Pope’s immediate supervision and direction, are the special depositaries and guardians. Moreover it is the Holy Father—entrusted as he is by God with the office of “teaching, governing, and piloting the whole Church”—who places these decrees before his children as claiming their assent. Living theologians of very high authority do not hesitate to assert, that every such doctrinal declaration possesses what they call “the infallibility of security,” even where it does not possess “the infallibility of truth.” In other words, they consider it infallibly certain that, under the circumstances of the time, religious truth is gravely injured if such declaration be interiorly disbelieved; and, on the other hand, is importantly promoted, in proportion as firm interior assent is yielded to it by the body of educated Catholics. We are only aware of one instance, in which it has even been alleged that any such declaration was erroneous; viz., the condemnation of Galileo. Different theologians solve this case differently. For ourselves we have repeatedly argued, that the doctrine of that decree was the one legitimate conclusion from all then cognisable data; and that those who did not at the time yield firm assent to that doctrine, by necessary consequence fell into one or other serious doctrinal error.

In fact, "Liberal Catholics" in their own persons emphatically testify, that intellectual submission, to an authority not strictly infallible, may often be the imperative dictate of reason. They will often use language of this kind :—"I neither hold," they will say, "that the 'Mirari vos' is infallible, nor even "that I am under any kind of obligation to accept its teaching. I am no theologian ; I cannot examine the matter for myself. But A. B., that distinguished French bishop,"—or "C. D., that distinguished German theologian,"—or "E. F., "that distinguished Catholic of some other country,"—as the case may be—"in whose opinion I have unbounded confidence, "assures me that there is no such obligation ; nay, that he "does not himself assent to the teaching of the 'Mirari vos.' " Well, but Pius IX. distinctly said, in his letter to M. de Beaulieu, that "humble submission " is due to that Encyclical ; and Gregory XVI., who issued it, pronounced the same judgment in every variety of shape. "Yes," reply the Liberals, "but these statements were not *ex cathedrâ* and infallible."\* Is A.B., then, or C. D. or E. F. infallible ? Of course not. These men will yield firm interior assent to the dicta of a mere A. B., or C. D., or E. F. ; and will yet refuse credence to the most emphatic words of him, whom the Church has infallibly declared to be "the teacher of all Christians."

We have been led into the whole course of thought which this article has exhibited, by some recent criticisms of the DUBLIN REVIEW. And we will now briefly apply it—so far as we have not done so already—to our own case. It is the duty of a Catholic Review to enter on various matters of philosophy and religious politics ; and it is of course therefore also its duty, to impress on its readers the obligation of accepting heartily all the Church's decisions within those spheres. Here in England there is a class of Catholics, uninfluential perhaps in numbers but certainly influential in ability, who expressly deny the existence of any such obligation : and it was therefore our duty to contend against these Catholics. But we have always felt the greatest objection to indulging in mere invective and declamation ; in expressing strongly any doctrine, not universally received, without also expressing our reasons for its acceptance. To act otherwise has always seemed to us a course, both in itself unworthy, and also quite sure to fail in impressing opponents. Now (as we said a page or two back) we did not, and do not, see

---

\* It can hardly be necessary again to say, how overwhelming is the evidence establishing the strictly *ex cathedrâ* and infallible character of the "Mirari vos."

how we could have given reasons for the obligation of which we speak, without discussing the extent of the Church's infallibility. It was precisely (what we must account) their contracted notions on this head, which seemed to us the very foundation underlying the various errors of those whom we desired to oppose. We have said this repeatedly. We have begged those of our critics who agree with us on the perilousness of these men's intellectual habits and tendencies, to explain how we could have opposed such habits and tendencies in any other way. No one has yet responded to our appeal and favoured us with any suggestion ; yet we do not find that their animadversions are on that account the less severe.

We have argued in the present article that the Church encourages these "aggressive controversies"; and that there is nothing in them which tends to obscure or disparage her unity of faith. And we further think that a Catholic Review is more suitably occupied with such controversies as these, than even with attacks on Protestantism. We have three reasons for this opinion. Firstly, a far smaller number of Protestants, than of Catholics whom we account unsound, hear of what is *said* in a Catholic Review. Secondly, there is much less danger of Catholics apostatizing, than of their unwarily embracing this or that condemned non-heretical error. And thirdly, though the former course is an immeasurably greater evil to *themselves*, it may in some cases be a *less* evil to the *Church* : for they do not remain to corrupt and taint her atmosphere.

At the same time we fully admit, that a right thing may be done in a very wrong way. We do not here refer to any doctrinal mistakes into which we may be thought to have fallen, for that would be to revive a controversy of which our readers have had a surfeit : we refer to faults of language, of tone, of manner. We have no doubt at all—and we deeply regret the circumstance—that we have fallen into many such faults ; and we heartily wish we saw their character more clearly, that we might learn to avoid them in future. We may be allowed to mention however—what we are sure will be borne out by all who have kindly made the experiment —that we have always received with much gratitude every suggestion for our improvement. And we will only add, as pleas in mitigation of judgment, (1) that every one has his own way of doing things, which is not exactly the same as other people's ; and (2) that—as our critics will themselves be the first in admitting—it is very far easier to criticise than to perform.

## ART. V.—THE CONVENT CASE.

*Saurin v. Star and Kennedy*.—Sole Unabridged and Authentic Report, with a Preface by JAMES GRANT, author of *God is Love*. Ward, Lock, & Tyler.

“**H**OW will you be tried?” asks the officer of an English court of every man put on his trial? and the formal answer is, “by God and my country.” The prisoner is said, in legal phrase, to “put himself upon his country,” “which country,” adds Blackstone, “the jury are.” We have then high legal authority for saying, that trial by jury tests not only the guilt or innocence of the prisoner at the bar, but the justice or injustice of his country. It has been made a charge against Ireland, that there have been times when men guilty of crimes against the law of the British Empire cannot be convicted by an Irish jury fairly chosen, and hence men have inferred, not merely “judex,” but “*Patria damnatur cum nocens absolvitur*.” If then, in any country the innocent have but too much cause to dread a jury, and would choose, if they could, to be tried by a judge alone, rather than by “their country,” we must repeat “*Patria damnatur*.” This seems to be the first teaching of the trial in the suit against the Irish nuns at Hull. It affords us some degree of test, how far England has yet learned to do justice to Catholics.

It may seem at this moment almost superfluous, to remind our readers what the question was, which the jury was empannelled to try. But in these days more than ever before, new matters chase each other through the public mind like the shadows of clouds over the sea, and before our article is in our readers’ hands, what “everybody” knows while we are writing, half the world may already have forgotten. Let us say then, that Miss Saurin, an Irish lady, demanded damages for a civil injury done her, as she alleged, by Mrs. Star, late superior of the sisters of mercy at Hull, and Mrs. Kennedy her assistant. She entered the Institute in Baggot Street, Dublin, in August, 1851, and was professed in 1853. In 1858, she was sent to a house at Clifford, in Yorkshire, of which Mrs. Star was superior, and from thence to Hull. She swore in court:—

I was on excellent terms with Mrs. Star and Mrs. Kennedy. Until 1860, my life passed very happily. Sometime in that year Mrs. Star asked me to tell her my confession—what had passed between me and my father—



confessor. I said, I thought it would be contrary to honour and to every regulation to do so. She insisted, and I said, I did not remember exactly what the priest had said.

The Lord Chief Justice asked—Did she ask you what the priest had said to you, as well as your confession to him?—Witness: Yes, my lord.—She then continued. She told me she would give me time; that I should go away and come back next day, to try and remember in the interval. Next day I still refused to do so, saying, I thought it would be a breach of honour to reveal anything that had been said to me in confession. She asked me several times during that day, and said, no other sister in the house had refused her. After this I saw a change in her manner to me. She said I had shown great want of confidence in her.\* . . .

The Lord Chief Justice.—Did she assign any reason for wanting to know your confession?—None, my lord.

Miss Saurin then went on to detail the cruelty and injustice with which she was treated from that time. In cross-examination three days later she repeated:—

I was on the most intimate terms with Mrs. Star down to the year 1860 or 1861. There were no complaints against me, up to that time, except faults general to all the sisters. No unfriendly feeling existed that I know of. The first breach occurred between us in 1860 or 1861, when Mrs. Star asked me to tell her what my father-confessor had said in my confession. She also wanted to know what the priest had said to me. I would not say that; to reveal what is said in confession is contrary to the rule of the Catholic Church, because Mrs. Star had told me that sister Mary Alayois [sic], Mrs. Ryan, had told her. I cannot say whether there was any one present when Mrs. Star asked me to tell her. It was in the convent in Willow Street, Hull, she asked me. I had never before been asked to reveal my confessions. I did not think it a very extraordinary thing to be asked about what had passed in confession. I should say it would be a breach of honour to have revealed it. I do not know whether it would have been a breach of rule. She gave me time—quarter or half an hour—to remember what I had said, and came back to ask me. I do not know where Mrs. Ryan now is. Mrs. Star repeated the request several times. It was during one of the “manifestations of conscience” that she made the request the second time. I do not know how often she asked me. I mentioned the matter in confession, as I was in doubt whether I had been guilty of an act of disobedience.

---

\* We have quoted these passages as they stand in the “sole unabridged and authentic report, with a preface by James Grant, author of ‘God is Love!’” partly because, without a fair sample, it would be almost impossible to give any idea how careless and slovenly this “sole authentic report” is. For that purpose, a few lines taken at random anywhere, would suffice. For instance, all the world knows that the jury found for the defendant on the two counts for “assault,” and for “imprisonment.” This “sole authentic report” gives in inverted commas, as a professed copy of their verdict “the jury find for the plaintiff on the count for assaults (the stripping and imprisonment); they also find for the plaintiff on the counts for libel and conspiracy,

Mrs. Star swore that she had never "either in 1860 or at any other time," asked Miss Saurin any question about her confessions, but said, "she was in the habit of volunteering information about her confession till I stopped it." The whole story about "giving time," &c., she denied in minute detail. It appeared that Mrs. Ryan (the nun whom Miss Saurin named as having revealed her confessions) went to Australia in 1859: every other sister who was asked, positively declared that nothing of the kind had ever happened to her knowledge or belief. It was also proved that Miss Saurin herself, in a letter to the Bishop, had given another account of the beginning of the quarrel inconsistent with this, and before the Bishop's commissioners (appointed to inquire into the case) a third account inconsistent with either of the other two. So much was this felt that the Solicitor-General, after having insisted in his opening speech upon this point,—her being required to reveal her confession—as a matter of great importance, and as the one cause of all that followed, did not venture so much as to refer to it in his answering speech (which the Lord Chief Justice called "one of the most able and eloquent speeches that he remembered in the whole course of his experience, which now extended to a remote period, and which treasured up the experience of the greatest men the bar of England ever produced"), and tacitly abandoning the truth of that charge, contented himself with a vague assertion "that it was making a mountain out of a molehill to say that the plaintiff had given three versions of the origin of the coldness which had led to the unhappy results that followed."

The Lord Chief Justice specially pressed this point upon the jury. He showed them, that as to all the charges of ill treatment, conspiracy, assault, imprisonment, &c., they all rested upon the oath of Miss Saurin, and upon that alone; so that unless her oath was fully worthy of absolute credit, the whole case fell to the ground. He showed, also, that if her remembrance of what had passed were correct, then they must conclude, that every one of the nuns (twelve in all) had been guilty of deliberate, gross, wilful, and repeated perjury. He pointed out the extreme importance, with this view, of ascertaining what the "real origin of the difference between the parties" was, and particularly called their attention to the entire discrepancy upon that point, between the opening speech

---

with damages £500, that is to say, £300 the dowry paid in by her, and £200." In the same page, the Lord Chief Justice is made to say, "It is all nonsense to talk about the common law, and that, under the common law witnesses could not be examined in this country!" A more worthless report we never remember to have seen.

of the Solicitor-General and his answer. In the answer, he said, "the Solicitor-General to my astonishment, departed from his own words and the words of his client." He carefully repeated the whole of the detailed statement made by Miss Saurin upon this subject, and said, "Now, this is a simple, plain, and consistent statement. The question is whether it be a truthful one. It appears to me a matter of very considerable moment, for enabling us to judge upon which side the truth really lies." The attempt of the Solicitor-General to undervalue the importance of this single point, he called "playing fast and loose with the jury and with himself," and declared that he "could not allow it;" and then repeated, that the one question was, whether that statement was true. Then, after saying, "now let us see by what evidence the story of the plaintiff is met, and then form your judgment as to the circumstances," he went at length into the evidence, which showed that Miss Saurin had been discontented and unhappy, and that great complaints had been made as to her conduct, not only since the alleged quarrel about her confession, but at every period since her profession; and that her brother (who was not forthcoming) had received from her such an account of her superiors in Baggot Street, that he had described them in a letter as "her torturers and tyrants." He showed that her statement, that she was sent to England, at the "pressing solicitations of Mrs. Star," was distinctly contradicted; so were all her representations about the schools at Clifford, when she was employed in them, and what she did in them. After showing how much more likely was Mrs. Star's account of the matter, he said, "I will tell you something far more important," namely, that

Her uncle, Father Matthews, came forward for her protection. He interposed and communicated with the Bishop. We know he saw his niece, and that he had an opportunity of conversing with her upon those matters; especially questioning her about the issue of the commission. In every inquiry which he made he says she made no complaint and no counter-charges against the sisters. *I ask you, as reasonable men, is it possible to believe* that if she had had it in her mind at that time that all this treatment to which she had been subjected had its origin in this refusal to communicate what had passed in confession, she would not have made the circumstance known. Why should she not? She looked to him as her natural protector. If she had so communicated to him, either in these visits, or when about to appear before the commission, do you for one moment believe that Father Matthews would not have communicated the statement to the Bishop, or brought it prominently forward as one of the charges to be made against the defendants? What a lever would it not have proved for Father Matthews to use with the view of overthrowing the conduct and authority of the (in

the report *his*) superior. Do you think he would not have used it to the Bishop when spoken to with reference to the complaints his niece had to make against the superioress, if such matters had indeed existed in reality? *Under these circumstances you have an oath against an oath, and it is for you to say what you believe.* Is it true that there was this endeavour on the part of the defendant, Mrs. Star, to extract, or rather I should say to extort, from this reluctant sister what had passed between her and her confessor? . . . . Is this story true? If you disbelieve it, it is a most inauspicious point from which to start in considering how the rest of the plaintiff's story arose. . . . . If it is as the plaintiff suggests, Mrs. Star's conduct was almost too abominable to be considered with patience and endurance.

We have not space for more than a very small part of the judge's charge, and have been obliged to omit in our extract parts which were evidently, as he spoke them, the most important of all, because they are made absolute nonsense in the vile report before us. At a later part of his charge he called attention to the fact that it was Miss Saurin's

Misfortune to have twelve witnesses against her, eight of whom had given such evidence that if they believed it her case must be demolished . . . . evidence was not to be taken by numbers but by its intrinsic weight; by weight rather than by tale: and if they believed, though she stood alone, that she told the truth, they would give due weight to it.

And then after speaking of the importance of hearing and seeing the witnesses in order to judge of their credibility, and saying that he believed he had gained, by long habit and experience, the power of judging when a witness was speaking the truth, he added:—

He must say he had never heard witnesses give their evidence in a manner to claim the respect of the judge [more] than had the sisters who had been called in this case. They all concurred that Mrs. Star was by no means arbitrary or unjust to any one; and that she had acquired the esteem and affectionate regard of the whole community except the plaintiff; and if Mrs. Star had been of an arbitrary disposition, that fact would have been known to . . . . the other sisters.

In a word, the Lord Chief Justice told the jury that the only question was, whether Miss Saurin's impression on the facts was to be believed in opposition to the oaths of the whole community; that upon one most important point it was impossible for them, as sensible men, to absolutely accept Miss Saurin's evidence; that they should bear in mind that circumstance when they came to weigh her remembrance on the other points against the oaths of all the other sisters; and, lastly, that those sisters had given their testimony in such a manner that it was impossible for a man of his

experience to doubt that they were speaking the truth. How her evidence had been given he did not say.

Like everybody else who has had anything to do with this case, we have found the single point we have selected for notice occupying far more space than we intended to give it. We must therefore pass over what we had intended to say on other points, only mentioning that the Lord Chief Justice repeatedly told the jury that the papers sent in to the Bishop were "privileged," and therefore would not be libels even though Miss Saurin were guiltless of the charges made against her, if Mrs. Star and Mrs. Kennedy had made them believing them to be true; and so, also, that there would be no conspiracy unless the two had combined to drive her out of the convent by unfair and unlawful means.

A paper which was very violent against Mrs. Star, said, very truly, that if the jury had been guided by the charge of the Lord Chief Justice, they would have returned a verdict for the defendants without leaving the box. Their verdict was for the plaintiff. How are we to account for so unusual a circumstance?

For our part we do not for a moment suspect that the jury intended any injustice—that they meant to go contrary to the oath they had taken, to give a verdict according to the evidence. It was their duty to weigh the evidence; and in weighing it there was a single circumstance which may have seemed to them decisive. Miss Saurin had left the convent, and the witnesses against her were nuns. Their first principle was, that a nun, however good, upright, and religious she might be, would feel it not merely allowable but a duty to perjure herself if perjury was useful in defence of her order. The whole of the evidence against Miss Saurin, therefore, they simply laid aside. They were sure that they could have known beforehand what it would be. It was simply worth nothing. It was to be regarded as if it had not been given. Her own evidence, therefore, was all that they had on the subject. No doubt the Lord Chief Justice had shown them that as reasonable men they could not receive it implicitly on one important point; that was to be regretted. But all the witnesses against her were sure to have perjured themselves on all points, because they were nuns.

We are sorry to say that the Solicitor-General condescended to suggest this. The Lord Chief Justice indignantly rejected it. The jury no doubt sincerely believed that the Solicitor-General was right and the Lord Chief Justice wrong.

Another *à priori* conviction fell in with this. It is to the English mind so certain that the superior of a convent is

always spiteful and tyrannical, that it really needed no proof in any individual instance. Of course she was.

Remembering the strength of these miserable prejudices, we are able to believe that the jurymen in the late case were guilty of no intentional or conscious injustice. But, alas, it is only because we are compelled to acknowledge that the mind of the nation at large is still so far warped, that in a case which touches Catholic nuns or Catholic priests (not to say, even Catholic laity, if they are suspected of being Catholics more than in name), it is still morally incapable of seeing and appreciating what is just and what is unjust. The jury is acquitted, but, alas, *Patria damnatur*.

Yes, alas, greatly as things are on the whole improved, "Trial by Jury," the boast and confidence of Englishmen, the "Palladium of British Freedom," is still to Catholics alone no protection against the grossest injustice—to them alone it still is "a fraud, a delusion, and a snare." Twenty years ago it used to be said that for any man wholly without scruples of conscience, especially if he were, in name, a Catholic, there could be no safer speculation, than to bring an action against Cardinal Wiseman. He had (every one felt) no need whatever of even a plausible case, but was from the first sure of success. What was true then is not less true now. It requires only to put in the place of Cardinal Wiseman the name of any Catholic authority, or even of any individual Catholic, provided he is supposed to be earnest in his religion.

And what makes this even more evident is, that in this case the jury was not, as has sometimes been said, composed of London shopkeepers. It was, with a few exceptions, a special jury, upon which none are qualified to sit except they be "described in the jurors' list as esquires or of higher degree, or as bankers or merchants." Such a jury, perhaps, more than any other, is really qualified to represent the country—the common prejudices and feelings of Englishmen—what in common parlance is described as "John Bull." And the applause with which the verdict was greeted, not only by the "unthinking populace," as the Lord Chief Justice said, outside the court; but, with very few exceptions,\* by the public press, marks the injustice even more strongly as a national act.

Once again, then, we are in the presence of that miserable evil, that plague-spot upon our race and nation, that prejudice

---

\* We see with real regret that not even the Ritualist newspapers are, as we should have hoped, altogether an exception. They cannot, of course, like the other Protestant newspapers, attack the religious life as such. But too generally they betray almost as much pleasure at any sneers at the sisters who are the special objects of injustice.



which, it has been most truly said, is "The life of the Protestant view." "Where are the tender hearts, the kind feelings, the upright understandings of our countrymen and countrywomen? Where is the generosity of the Briton, of which from one's youth up one has been so proud? Where is his love of fair play, and his compassion for the weak, and his indignation at the oppressor, when we are concerned? The most sensible people on the earth, the most sensitive of moral inconsistency, the most ambitious of propriety and good taste, would rather commit themselves in the eyes of the whole world; would rather involve themselves in the most patent incongruities and absurdities; would rather make sport, as they do by their conduct, for their enemies in the four quarters of the earth, than be betrayed into any portion—I will not say of justice, I will not say of humanity and mercy, but of simple reasonableness and common sense, in their behaviour to the professors of the Catholic religion; so much so, that to state even drily and accurately what they do is to risk being blamed for ridicule and satire, which, if anywhere, would be simply gratuitous and officious in this matter, where truth most assuredly 'when unadorned' is 'adorned the most.'" Nor can we shut our eyes to the miserable truth that this prejudice is "not laughable but hateful and dangerous—dangerous to the Catholic, hateful to the Supreme Judge. When you see a beast of prey in his cage, you are led to laugh at its impotent fury, its fretful motions and its sullen air, and its grotesque expressions of impatience, disappointment, and malice if it is balked of its revenge. And as to this Prejudice, really it is in itself one of the direst, most piteous, most awful phenomena in the whole country, to see a noble, generous people the victims of a moral infirmity, which is now a fever, now an ague, now a falling sickness, now a S. Vitus's dance. Oh, if we could see as the angels see! Thus should we speak of it, and in language far more solemn—not simply because the evil comes from beneath, as I believe it does—not only because it so falls upon the soul and occupies it, that it is like a bad dream or nightmare, which is so hard to shake off, but because it is one of the worst sins of which our poor nature is capable." \*

Our quotation is growing beyond reasonable limits, and we can hardly doubt that it is familiar to all our readers.

What is left for us Catholics but to call upon Him "who alone can rule the unruly wills and affections of sinful men,"—to call

---

\* Lectures on the present position of Catholics in England. By J. H. Newman, D.D., Lecture VI.

upon Him in the words of His prophet, "Lord, open the eyes of these men that they may see." That before it is too late they may see in those, of whom their traditionary prejudice now leads them to assume, without deeming any proof necessary, every conceivable abomination, the indwelling (even now scarcely veiled, for it beams through their meek countenances which breathe a peace not of this world, and through their Christ-like lives) of Him for whose visible return the whole creation is waiting, groaning, and travailing in pain; of Him to whom His people are ever crying out, from all quarters of the world, in the varying tongues of all kindreds and nations and tribes—

"Come then, and, added to Thy many crowns,  
Receive yet one—the crown of all the earth.  
Thou who alone art worthy! It was Thine  
By ancient covenant ere nature's birth.  
And Thou hast made it Thine by purchase since,  
And overpaid its value with Thy blood.  
Thy Saints proclaim Thee King, and Thy delay  
Gives courage to their foes, who, could they see  
The dawn of Thy last advent long desired,  
Would creep into the bowels of the earth,  
And flee for shelter to the falling rocks."

Of that day Father Harper says, in a very solemn passage of his beautiful sermon,\* just published,—

The Resurrection in its fulness will then be accomplished. For Christ shall rise from death, in His mystical body the Church. And then each silent transfiguration of her every member shall be told out publicly before the generations of time, and "there is nothing secret which shall not be revealed." Then the life of grace shall hold its own; and the last shall be first, and the first last. On that day trials shall be reheard, unjust judgments reversed, the calumniator exposed, and innocence fully justified. Then those hirelings of bigotry and of hatred to Christ's Church, who have insulted Him in His chosen spouses, will be glad to shelter themselves beneath that lowly veil, which in the very precincts of a court of justice—nay, in the court itself, till the stern authority of the judge interfered—has been made the object of ribaldry and illegal sibilations. Then history will end, newspapers perish in the flames of judgment, and the world's feverish turmoil come to nought; but each deed of grace, not one excepted, shall live for ever, recorded by angels in the book of life. That will be a history of which the world has little dreamt, and which will teach it a wisdom, that alas! will come too late"—

What follows is too solemn to be quoted here; although we

---

\* We have noticed elsewhere this sermon, and that of Father Cole on the same subject.

would heartily wish to commend it to the serious attention of all, whether Protestants or Catholics, who are tempted by the sympathy of those around them, and by the general acclamation of the world in which they live to take part by deed, or word, or thought, or silence, against those "whom God delights in, and in whom He dwells."

Most truly and forcibly has it been shown, both by F. Harper and F. Coleridge, that the general feeling of our English world, even of those who have spoken in the most friendly tone of the late revelation of the interior of the religious life, has been that of men quite unconscious of all that is summed up in the one word *Nazareth*. Most strange, most lamentable inconsistency—this is the case with multitudes who would be sincerely shocked if it were supposed that they disbelieve the doctrine it expresses. They do not disbelieve it, but they do not see that it has any bearing upon common, trivial, everyday life. Surely common sense ought to bear witness that if the Eternal Creator really became an infant, a child, a boy, a man, and went through the trivial ground of man's life; and has chosen out of the world a people to be conformed to His image; it is impossible that there can be any action of their lives too trivial to perpetuate and reflect that astounding mystery. Such inconsistencies, experience tells us, are not uncommon, but it tells us also that they are the marks of a period of transition—that a people which forms the habit of acting and speaking and thinking as if it did not acknowledge, a truth which is in its nature most strictly practical, is on the point of consciously abandoning it. Before another generation has passed, we may be too sure, the class of men who now admit the Incarnation of the Eternal Son, but regard it as an unpractical doctrine, will have learnt to deny it. There is, then, no time to be lost, and we may thank God that the Catholic Church, so long, like the prophet, driven by persecution into the wilderness, has once more come forward, like him, face to face with the multitude of our countrymen, to cry, "How long will ye halt between two opinions; if the Lord be God follow Him, but if Baal then follow him!"

And assuredly, inasmuch as actions do more than words, there are none by whom this appeal is so forcibly impressed upon our countrymen as by those men and women, who have given up all for Christ, and whose lives re-echo what the life of the Blessed Apostle also taught before he put in words, "The things that were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for

Whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them but as dung that I may gain Christ, and may be found in Him." Many, no doubt, of those who are following his example are living in the world. But the world knows them not. But whether it will hear, or whether it will refuse, the lesson is forced upon it, by those of either sex who are specially called to a visible and professed conflict with the opinions and the course of their age and nation. The Solicitor-General expressed an opinion that "in the Middle Ages, when men were rougher, if they were more simple, than they are now, the great monastic system had its recommendations as well as its faults, but that it is altogether unsuited to the people of this time and the wants of the world in which we live." In truth, however, necessary as it is in both states of society, it seems more needed now than then. For the peculiar danger of times peaceable, civilized, and smooth like ours, is from the world. In rough and violent times the power of the flesh and the devil may have been greater; but that of the world was comparatively small. In the Middle Ages it was not merely by great Saints, like S. Elizabeth of Hungary, that the world was despised and trampled upon. Her greatest persecutors, great princes, who, but a while before, had violently struck her, without shame or scruple, in a manner which, in our day, would have been disgraceful to a coalheaver, were no sooner touched with the sense of their sins, than they willingly abased themselves in humble penance before the eyes of the whole world.\* In our day, the course of society is so smooth and unbroken, that although, thank God, there are many whose inward lives are lives of faith, prayer, and penance, there would be nothing to bear open witness, seen and read of all men (as S. Paul says), that the whole course of the world, its wealth, pleasures, refinement, luxury, ambition, greatness, are but an empty sham, and that the true measure of all things is the Cross of Christ; if we had not our societies of men and women, whose whole lives are openly and visibly devoted to the imitation of the Cross. In England, too, as it now is, they are, in one respect, far more blessed than they were in the Middle Ages, inasmuch as they are more like their Lord. Then, as now, they were like Him in poverty, labours, and sufferings. But in the Middle Ages, rich and poor, nobles and serfs, vied with each other to do them honour. Emperors and kings humbly asked to be permitted to die in their habit, and to be buried in their cloisters. In our modern world they are despised and reviled. In our day, then, they have one beatitude

---

\* See Montalembert's "Life of S. Elizabeth."

more than of old, that pronounced upon those whom men revile, and of whom they speak all manner of evil falsely, for the sake of Christ. To do good and to be despised as evil, in what could the image of Christ be more complete?

The warning given by Father Coleridge is most seasonable, that we should not suppose that the outward usefulness of the religious orders is their real perfection and glory. Their perfection, doubtless, is in their hidden life. Yet their visible life also is, in an especial sense, "the salt of the earth." One lesson is especially impressed upon us by the history of the ancient world. It is that, although a heathen nation, in its more simple state, may preserve a high excellence in some natural virtues, no heathen nation ever yet attained great prosperity, wealth, and civilization, without becoming utterly corrupt; and that, when this tide of corruption had once set in upon it, there, in an heathen nation, was nothing to offer to it any effectual opposition. The natural attractions of ease, wealth, luxury, and pleasure were always found too strong for the feeble resistance that could be offered by the instincts of conscience, the traditions of past ages, and the cold arguments of philosophers. And hence heathen society no sooner became rich and luxurious, than it fell into hopeless and unresisted corruption, and there was nothing more to be hoped, except that, by some terrible stroke of divine judgment, it should be utterly swept away, so that room might be left for the development of some less corrupted race. In many respects modern Europe is but too evidently following in wake of these "giant forms of empires on their way to ruin." And if we are still hopeful that something better is reserved for her, it is because we see, in the midst of her most corrupt societies, exactly what was wanting in the heathen world,—the salt of the earth. Ten righteous would have sufficed to save Sodom. And no nation can become universally tainted, as long as it contains any considerable number, whose Life is, the Everlasting Son in man's flesh—not His precepts merely, or even His example, but his indwelling—Himself. And in a Christian country this is held out as a thing real and actual, in its measure by the lives of Christians in the world, but especially, and in the highest sense, by the religious orders.

And hence we cannot doubt that the attention which the late trial has called to our convents, must in the end produce not evil but good. "A city seated on a mountain cannot be hid." Those who know how deeply the English mind has been, and, in the less instructed classes at least, still is penetrated by the monstrous lies invented to sustain and propagate the great Protestant tradition—"chains, dungeons, tortures,

underground passages, and nameless immoralities,"\* cannot but hope some good from the fact that the interior life of a convent has, for the first time, been turned inside out before the British public, and no pretence of any scandal has been found,† "no constrained or unwilling inmate, no prisoner pining for release, no trace or vestige of all that system of corruption which has fed the imagination of the enemies of the Church." What would not have been given for anything approaching to a scandal by the party which is at this moment hiring wretches to corrupt the minds of boys and girls by setting forth in glowing colours detailed pictures of the vice which they say goes on in convents? Some will indignantly reply that nothing said by such wretches can really be believed by any one. But it is to be remembered that, only eighteen years ago, a statement to the same effect was made in the grossest possible language in the House of Commons by a man of high birth, extraordinary, though perverted, talents and attainments, and the member for one of the most populous of English counties. It can hardly fail that what has lately passed must tend to dispel the lurking remains of this delusion. It is true indeed‡ that the world finding that

"Beelzebub is not there, forgets all that it has ever said about him, and asks for a sign. Show us something lofty, something heroic, something dignified, something supernatural in this system. It is no longer black, dark, diabolical; but it is mean, trivial, prosaic, common-place."

Still we cannot doubt that, as the worst delusion is dispelled, there will be those who will begin to discover that these details, petty as they seem, are indeed the veil behind which is hidden a Presence which here on earth man cannot openly look upon.

One circumstance we must mark, which is at least hopeful. Nothing, evidently enough, could exceed the prejudice of the jury the other day. But, a few years ago, as the memory of the Achilli case warns us, we should have been likely to find

\* F. Coleridge, p. 11.

† The Solicitor-General made a great point of the complaint made by some of the Nuns to the Bishop as to Miss Saurin's behaviour towards a priest. He pressed it upon the jury that though Mrs. Star swore to the contrary, she must have intended it to be understood that there was something immoral in Miss Saurin's conduct. We do not doubt he did this in good faith, and that it had a great effect on the jury. The words would naturally be so understood by any one who had been brought up in the common Protestant prejudice as to what convent-life is. No one who knew what it really is would have so understood them; accordingly, it is important to observe that it never struck either Mrs. Star or the Bishop that they were capable of such an interpretation.

‡ F. Coleridge, p. 11.



prejudice as rampant on the bench as in the box. Here, then, there was a great change. For if the Lord Chief Justice showed a strong leaning against the convent in the earlier days of the trial, it was not so much that he was stubbornly prejudiced against the nuns, as that he believed Miss Saurin's testimony. The general feeling, even among Catholics, at that stage of the trial, was that there must have been great fault on the side of the superiors. For no one who heard or read her evidence, could easily believe that it was all absolutely without foundation. It is evident that the Lord Chief Justice, like other fair men, totally changed his view of both parties when he had heard the evidence of Mrs. Star and Mrs. Kennedy. After that nothing could be more fair than his conduct throughout, and his charge, as we have already shown, was as strong as a judge's charge could properly be in favour of the defendants. He could not be expected to understand the motives and principles of nuns, and it was hardly necessary that he should, from time to time, declare that he did not. It is even amusing to find that he hoped "the public exposure" of such penances as kissing the floor and wearing a duster "would prevent their repetition." We are sure that the gratitude of the nuns will induce them to do what they can to repay his kindness, not exactly in the way he supposes, by modifying the interior practices of the convent to suit the taste of "the public," but by giving the Lord Chief Justice the benefit of their prayers. Who can say how much they may benefit him?

---

ART. VI.—F. PEREZ' AND MR. LONGFELLOW'S DANTE.

*I Sette Cerchi del Purgatorio di Dante.* Saggio di Studj di PAOLO PEREZ, Prete Veronese. Seconda edizione. Ritoccata e accresciuta d'all' Autore. Verona, 1867.

*The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri.* Translated by HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. "Purgatorio." London: George Routledge & Sons.

THE essay which stands first at the head of this article, and of which we are about to attempt an analysis, is the work of a priest of the Order of Charity, and a descendant of the family of Alighieri. F. Perez writes with the enthusiasm of a kinsman and a fellow-countryman of the great Catholic poet of Italy. He writes, moreover, as a priest and a theologian who has the keys of the stores of moral and spiritual instruc-

tion which lie hid in the mysterious treasure-house of the *Divina Commedia*. He shows us that purgatory is there set before us as a system rather penitential than penal, divided, as it were, into seven spiritual hospitals, through which pass successively the souls which have failed during their life on earth to attain the full moral perfection for which they were created, and yet have not rendered themselves altogether incapable of it; where punishment as such becomes but a secondary end, being made the instrument of perfection and peace, thus acquiring in the eyes of the sufferers themselves a supernatural and inestimable value which sets it far above every created good.

The "Purgatorio" he shows to be a poem teaching the sublimest truths, and profitable to all classes of men. It teaches philosophers and theologians how, by dint of love and suffering, the imperfect soul is restored to the image of that perfect Archetype who, by the surpassing love and unequalled sufferings of His Divine Humanity, has rendered it capable of perfection. It suggests to physicians, instructors, and priests the art of discriminating between malady and remedy, showing them the wisdom of waiting, so as to avoid the necessity of retracing false steps. It proves to legislators and magistrates how vain it is to attempt to restrain crime by punishments which aim merely at infliction of deserved chastisement and not also at the rectifying of the will; how still more vain the hope to rectify the will without separating the criminal from evil companions, and placing him in the society of the good; how vainest of all are penal systems without the spirit of penance. Ascetics and penitents may here find consolation and strength, and learn by what exercises the soul is disentangled from the images and memories which retard or render idle the Godlike and beatific instinct with which it was created. Sculptors, painters, and all lovers of the fine arts may here recognize the types of their fairest and most sublime imaginations in the likeness of souls still bearing the shadowy impress of the bodies which once weighed them to earth, and now struggling heavenward towards their ideal in the mind of God through a series of spiritual transformations, wherein the image of loving, calm, and sublime sorrow presents an ideal of beauty far truer and more intense than the anguish of the far-famed Laocoön. Lastly, it has a lesson and an encouragement for all (and how many are they?) who do not disown, or despair of, or blaspheme all virtue and all effort after virtue, and who bear within themselves a consciousness that they are neither wholly good nor wholly evil.

Dante, as all his readers know, places his purgatory in an island directly opposite Jerusalem, then supposed to be the central point of our hemisphere. In the midst of this island rises a mountain shaped like a truncated cone, terminating in a beautiful plain (Adam's briefly-enjoyed terrestrial paradise). At the foot of the mountain await for a certain time, in sorrowful expectation, the laggard souls who have delayed repentance till the hour of death, and are not yet accounted worthy to enter upon those more vigorous penal exercises which are to free them from all imperfection, and which are performed in seven several circles corresponding to the seven deadly sins. After passing successively through all these stages of purification, the soul enjoys for a moment its perfect enfranchisement in the paradise on the mountain-top, whence, having fulfilled the last rites of expiation, it ascends to the beatific vision of God.

Omitting for the present the preparation and completion of the purification (the *ante-purgatorio* and the terrestrial paradise), our author, before he enters upon the exposition of the seven circles, unfolds, on the authority of the theologians of the Church and chiefly of S. Thomas, the theory of purgatory, or of the painful yet loving process which removes the vestiges left, even by forgiven sin, upon the soul of man. These vestiges are—I. A debt of punishment, which he who has infringed the order of God's government has justly incurred at the hand of the Author of that order. II. An evil inclination of the will, or an evil habit already begun; for every act of the soul leaves in the soul a tendency to repeat itself, and the free will which by its fault has turned from the unchangeable good to transitory goods would tend perpetually in the forbidden direction unless aided by a supernatural power to right itself. III. A similar inclination in the inferior powers, which have ministered to the will in the sinful act—certain blind inclinations which constitute so many inferior wills continually soliciting the supreme will to its repetition.

It is next to be observed that the three effects above mentioned are not ordinarily altogether removed by the sinner's reconciliation with God. I. When the eternity of punishment, which must have accompanied an eternity of sin, has been remitted by justification, every debt is not thereby cancelled. For he who has allowed himself an unlawful pleasure has incurred, by the moral law, an equal amount of justly-imposed pain; and as the pleasure, which was (so to speak) infinite in the criminal's desire, has become finite, so the punishment, which his obstinacy in sin would have rendered eternal, has been exchanged for a temporal penalty. II. Nor is the sin

itself ordinarily so remitted as to leave no trace behind. There will in most cases remain some partial disorder, some darkness in the intellect, some undue, perhaps some unobserved, disposition of the will, some wavering or languor in good, which incline to venial sins, thus depriving the soul of its former freshness and beauty. III. And the shadow of the guilty act falls still more darkly on the blind and inferior powers, wherein the inclination remains, notwithstanding the renewal of the will. Such is the condition of the souls in purgatory, who, having departed in charity and absolved from all mortal sins, yet by reason of debts of punishment not yet satisfied, or of vestiges of venial imperfections or disorderly inclinations, are detained from the vision of God.

Now by what means are these impediments to be wholly removed? For the first and third a punishment inflicted on the senses might suffice. The unlawful pleasure having been tasted by their means, it seems fitting that on them should fall the penalty, which might also consist in acts so painfully contrary to the evil inclinations which they have contracted as by degrees wholly to cancel it. But to remove the second impediment some deep inward and spiritual act of the soul itself is required to disperse all darkness of the intellect and shake off all inertness of the will, thus setting it free to find its union with the Supreme Truth and Justice which is impeded by these ligaments that fetter the free exercise of charity which would carry it straight to God.

Besides the exercise of the intellect and will nothing more seems needful to the perfect deliverance of the soul but the presence of some benign and merciful agency to assist and console it under the twofold process of purification. In the *Purgatorio* we find these three means prescribed:—

I. There is a special sensible suffering, which, while it discharges the debt of punishment entailed by the sinful act on the inferior powers, cancels, by vigorous acts of a contrary tendency, the evil inclination left by that act.

II. A special meditation and a special prayer, which, by enlightening the intellect and inflaming the will, excite the soul to acts of charity opposed to the former acts of sin, and thus enable it gradually to free itself from every bond and to cast off every burthen.

III. The loving guardianship of an angel, who aids and impels the penitent souls in this their labour of love.

A question here suggests itself, which has already been asked and answered by S. Thomas,—How, when the body no longer weighs down the spirit, which is now confirmed in grace, disorderly inclinations can be supposed to exist in the

inferior powers which lie perfectly dormant, or in the will which is incapable of the slightest movement towards evil? The difficulty (says our author) will vanish on a more profound investigation of the laws of psychology. For every act of the human soul, although performed by means of the senses, leaves in the soul itself a disposition or actual tendency (*resto di attualita*) which, unless we suppose the soul to be annihilated or wholly changed by death, must cleave to it after its separation from the body. Philosophers and theologians speak of the tendency of the disembodied spirit to unite itself once more to its body, and this general tendency implies a particular tendency to the acts formerly performed by means of the body, which, if these acts have been contrary to order, will, although disavowed by the personal will now confirmed in holiness, constitute a disorder which perfect love cannot endure to behold in itself.\* Again, it may be asked how, in a state where no fresh store of merits can be acquired, such tendencies can be destroyed, or progress be made in charity and perfection?

Be it observed, then, that venial faults, like so many slight cords, impede the exercise of charity in its more exquisite and fervent acts. These bonds are gradually unloosed by the exercises of purgatory, whereby the soul, without the acquisition of any new merit, is enabled to exercise the acts which had been hitherto impeded by some fault of nature, or some want of correspondence with grace.

P. Perez just touches upon another mysterious question, the acquisition in the other life by the sensitive principle in the soul of a new corporeal term (besides the term of unlimited space), which may aid it to rise and to free itself, after a manner analagous to that in which the earthly body once enslaved and weighed it down;—amends being thus made to the soul of the just for its temporary separation from the body by some mysterious gift from that Man-God with whom *the Father has given us all things*.

Dante's conception of the new aerial body wherewith he invests the departed soul seems to our author to be in accordance with the sentiments of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church on this mysterious subject:—

---

\* *Licet ex corruptione corporis sit aliqua causa venialium, non tamen venialia sunt sicut in subjecto in corpore, sed in animâ; unde non sunt dispositiones materiæ sed formæ. (De Malo, q. vii. art. 11, ad. 15.) Quamvis veniale ex pronitate fomitis contingat, tamen culpa in mente consequitur; et ideo etiam destructo fomite, adhuc manere potest. (V. dist. art. 3, ad. 5.)*

Tosto che Luogo li la circoscrive,  
 La virtù formativa raggia intorno  
 Così e quanto nelle membra vive.\*—*Purg.* xxv. 85.

And again :—

A sofferer tormenti e caldi e geli  
 Simili corpi la Virtù dispone,  
 Che, come fa, non vuol che a noi si sveli.†—iii. 31.

Clothed, then, in this new aerial vesture, and borne along in a swift bark, which barely skims the surface of the waves that encompass our miserable world, impelled, instead of sail or oar, by the white gleaming wings of a blessed angel, the happy souls chanting the *In exitu Israel de Ægypto*, approach the shores of purgatory, bearing in the burthen of their song and the light upon their brows the sweet assurance of their eternal bliss, and a reflection of the ray just cast upon them from the countenance of that merciful Judge, which they long to behold once more beaming upon them with unalloyed complacency.

The pains of sense endured by the souls in the *Purgatorio*, though not falling far short in intensity of some of the fearful tortures of the *Inferno*, differ from them in several remarkable points. In that dread abode which no ray of light or love shall ever enter, where discord and horror reign eternally, the miserable souls, now confirmed in the hatred of all good, stand apart, each in his own individual misery, like blasted ruins scattered here and there. They have no link of brotherhood between them, and the poet's imagination has exhausted itself in picturing for them every kind and degree of horrible and loathsome punishment. Each soul in purgatory, on the other hand, is a type of beauty, awaiting but the removal of some light veil, some slight deformity, to shine for ever in the regions of light and love, and bearing, even under the temporary veil which shrouds it, some similitude to Him who was pleased to receive in His own Human Body the fiercest assaults of pain and sorrow, thus investing human suffering with a dignity and efficacy which might mature His Divine Image in the souls predestined to bear it throughout eternity.

---

\* Soon as the place there circumscribeth it,  
 The virtue informative rays round about  
 As and as much as in the living members.

† To suffer torments both of cold and heat,  
 Bodies like this that Power provides, which wills  
 That how it works be not unveiled to us.

—Longfellow's translation.



In harmony with each other, and in union with their Divine Head, the blessed souls press on together from one stage of purification to another, till the last cloud melts away which veils from them the face of God. And in the process of their purification we have no images to horrify or disgust, no loathsome forms, no ghastly and unnatural transformations, such as freeze our blood as we read the *Inferno*. In the words and actions of these vessels of election (*d'animo turba tacita e devota*,\* xxiii. 21) all is calm, decorous, and dignified. The fire burns and refines, but blasts not nor disfigures its willing, and more than willing, victims. S. Catherine of Genoa tells us that there is no contentment like to that of the saints in heaven except the contentment of the souls in purgatory. And thus it must be with a soul created (as that loving saint says again) with the *beatific instinct*. As soon as it perceives in the region of truth that beatitude can be attained only by suffering, it acquires what Dante calls *il talento* (the longing desire) of suffering. It desires suffering with the same intensity as it desires beatitude. Only when it is perfectly pure does this desire cease, because it is already blessed in Him to whom it is perfectly united. This truth is expressed in the verses which describe a conflict as subsisting between the desire of beatitude and the desire of suffering so long as the slightest vestige of the debt remains to be discharged, and ceasing at the moment when it is fully cancelled.

Della mondizia, il sol voler fa prova,  
Che, tutto libero a mutar convento,  
L'alma sorprende, e di voler le giova.

Prima vuol ben ; ma non lascia il talento,  
Che divina giustizia, contra voglia,  
Come fu al peccar, pone al tormento.†—*Purg.* cxxi. 61-66.

This deliberate complacency in suffering is the secret of the sweet and modest serenity which shines through all the torments of the second canto. And it is seen even in those who had sinned longest and repented only at the last.

\* A crowd of spirits silent and devout.—*Longfellow*.

† Of purity the will alone gives proof,  
Which, being wholly free to change its convent  
Takes by surprise the soul, and helps it fly.

First it wills well ; but the desire permits not,  
Which divine justice with the self-same will,  
There was to sin, upon the torment sets.—*Longfellow*.

Noi fummo tutti già per forza morti,  
 E peccatori insino all' ultim' ora ;  
 Quivi lume del ciel ne fece accorti,  
 Si che pentendo e perdonando, fuora  
 Di vita uscimmo a Dio pacificati,  
 Che del disio di se veder ne accuora.\*—C. v. 52-57.

Thus does Dante reverently remind them of the steadfast hope which sweetens all their pains :—

*O creatura che ti mondi per tornar bella a Colui che ti fece (3) ; Spirito . . . che per salir ti domi (4) ; O ben finiti, o già spiriti eletti (5) ; O eletti di Dio, li cui soffriri Egiustizia e pietade fa men duri (6) ; O anime sicure D' aver, quando che sia, di pace stato (7) ; O gente sicura . . . di veder l' alto lume che il disio vostro solo ha in sua cura (8) ; ecc.†*

From the same cause proceeds their eager solicitude not to lose a single drop of suffering. They will not suspend their penance to converse with Dante. One constrains him to bend down with him as he bears his heavy burden ; another *loves better to weep than to speak* ; another beseeches him not to hinder his tears ; another leaves him behind because time is too precious in this land ; another, as he approaches him, is careful not to issue from the fire. The source of this thirst for suffering in the Sacred Heart of Him who so thirsted for it on the cross is thus profoundly and beautifully indicated by the penitents, who are consumed by desire for the unapproachable fruit which ever eludes their touch.

E quella voglia all' albero ci mena,  
 Che menò Cristo in croce a dire *Eli*,  
 Quando ne liberò colla sua vena.‡—*Purg.* xxiii. 72-75.

But what is physical pain without intelligence and love ? Scarcely does it deserve the name, for the essential part of suffering is the loving knowledge of the good of which it

\* Long since we all were slain by violence,  
 And sinners even to the latest hour ;  
 Then did a light from heaven admonish us,  
 So that, both penitent and pardoning, forth  
 From life we issued reconciled to God,  
 Who with desire to see Him stirs our hearts.—*Longfellow*.

† O creature that dost cleanse thyself to return beautiful to him who made thee (3) ; Spirit . . . who stoapest to ascend (4) ; O happy dead, O spirits elect already (5) ; O ye elect of God, whose sufferings Justice and Hope both render less severe (6) ; O souls secure in the possession, whene'er it may be, of a state of peace (7) ; O people certain . . . of beholding the high light which your desire has solely in its care (8).—*Longfellow*.

‡ For the same wish doth lead us to the tree  
 Which led the Christ rejoicing to say *Eli*,  
 When with His veins He liberated us.

deprives us. Therefore the pain of sense is intensified in the suffering souls by the intimate knowledge of the Beloved Object from whom they are separated, and that knowledge is perfected by assiduous meditations on the beauty of the virtue which they have hitherto neglected, and the deformity and misery of the vice by which they have once been seduced. The points of this twofold meditation are given by means of manifold images, setting before the penitents the example of celebrated personages who have been remarkable for the sublimest acts of the virtue to be imitated, or the most hideous forms of the opposite vice, this order in the exercises being uniformly observed, that the images of virtue meet us at the entrance of each circle, while the images of vice are presented to us as we leave it to ascend to the next. For virtue and beauty and goodness are absolute and eternal things, inherent in the intrinsic order of Being, while vice and deformity and evil are but their privation and defect, and unless we would travel backwards we must first ascend to the typical conceptions of good, and when we have received them into our hearts and imaginations we shall easily discern and lament the manifold ways in which the privation and defect of good generate every miserable shape of evil; whereas, by the sole or principal study of evil we shall never ascend to the true knowledge and possession of good.

The Archetype in whom are comprised all the special types presented by the whole company of the elect is unquestionably Christ our Lord, in whom and for whom they were created to become objects worthy of the Father's love. But, amongst them all, there is one who reflects His Image more fully and perfectly than any other, one blessed being, who, because she is His Mother, bears in her features by the laws of nature the likeness of His human countenance, and, by a gift of ineffable grace, mirrors (as far as a created nature can) His virtues and perfections in her soul—a creature irradiated far beyond any other by the glory of the Creator, and thus fitted by the effulgence of her light and love to assist all who have not yet attained the perfection of their being, to ascend to the eternal Pattern awaiting them in heaven. Thus, in the *Paradiso*, S. Bernard points out the Mother of God:—

Reguarda omai nella faccia, che a Cristo  
Più s' assomiglia ; che la sua chiarezza  
Sola ti può disporre a veder Cristo.\*

—*Parad.* xxxi. 85.

---

\* Look now upon the face which most  
Resembles Christ, for only by its glory  
It shall prepare thee to behold His face.

In every circle we find a series of acts of public and private virtue arranged with consummate wisdom. But the sweet image of Mary always takes precedence of them all, radiant with that moral beauty which belongs to completeness and perfection, as if to teach the penitent souls that they are to be perfected, not by mere fragments of natural virtues, but by that fulness of evangelical sanctity which binds together all the natural virtues, supernaturalizes them, and makes them acceptable to God.

Thus she, who in the first canto calls Lucia to unveil the light of wisdom before the poet's eyes, and in the last, obtains for him the gift of the beatific vision—that same sweet and sovereign Lady casts, in the second, a merciful glance upon the penitents in purgatory. They behold her in seven diversified and lovely forms as the Queen of the seven virtues, which generate all the rest; the most beloved, the most lovely, the most loving of all creatures next to Him who is the purifier of all spirits, and whose Image she ever bears with her, like a rainbow refracting the rays of the Sun of Justice over those seven blessed circles where the prisoners of hope are purified by love and prayer.

The compunction and devotion of the suffering, yet blessed souls, thus enkindled by meditation, find utterance in fervent prayer. And the prayers which Dante puts into their mouths are words taken from the Psalms, the Gospels,\* or the hymns of the Church. They are words fulfilled in Christ, taught by Christ, or breathed by Christ into the heart of His spouse, the Church; words full of the saving power of Him who by His word created and renews all things in heaven and earth. And each special prayer has a singular correspondence with the pain endured, and the images contemplated in each circle, and with the words repeated by the presiding angel. The souls in each circle often pray in common.

*Una parola in tutte era ed un modo.\*—Purg. xvi. 20.*

Sometimes only the first words or some fragments of a prayer reach our ears, suggesting the whole train of thought which belongs to it. Their prayers are mingled with tears, tears which become fuller and fuller of joy as, step by step, chanting their gradual Psalms, they ascend the ladder of purification.

Their prayer is threefold—I. For the loosing of the bonds which still keep them from the sight of God. II. For those whom they have left behind on earth; this petition being

---

\* One word there was in all, and metre one.—*Longfellow.*

couched in the all-comprehensive clause of the Paternoster which asks for deliverance from evil:—

Quest' ultima preghiera, Signor caro,  
 Gia non si far per noi, chi non bisogna,  
 Ma per color che dietro noi restaro.\*

III. Their prayer ascends in charitable supplication and thanksgiving for each other. Thus when, by the direct action of the sacred Humanity as by an electric touch, they learn the joyful tidings that another soul has happily ended its probation, and is come to purify itself with them, a triumphant *Te Deum* rises from all the denizens of purgatory. No sooner has the thunder-crash of the opening gates struck upon Dante's ear than it is greeted by this sweet harmonious welcome from the voices of a multitude of brethren, breathing hope and courage into his trembling heart:—

Io mi revolsi attento al primo tuono,  
 E Te Deum laudamus, mi pareva  
 Udir in voce mista a dolce suono.  
 Tale imagine a punto mi rendea  
 Cio ch' i' udiva, qual prender si suole  
 Quando a cantar con organi si stea.  
 Ch' or sì or no s' intendo le parole.†—lx. 139–145.

Another triumphant chorus intones a *Gloria in excelsis*, which shakes the mountain to its very base, as each soul, free from the last remaining bond, and conscious of its perfect purification, rises spontaneously from the flames which have no longer any power to hurt it, and passes through the open gate of paradise.‡ Thus on the joyful morning which precedes

\* This last petition verily, dear Lord,  
 Not for our sakes is made, who need it not,  
 But for their sake who have remained behind us.  
 —Longfellow.

† At the first thunder-peal I turned attentive,  
 And “Te Deum laudamus” seemed to hear  
 In voices mingled with sweet melody.  
 Exactly such an image rendered me  
 That which I heard, as we are wont to catch,  
 When people singing with the organ stand;  
 For now we hear, and now hear not, the words.—Longfellow.

‡ “I see,” says S. Catherine of Sienna, “that on God's part paradise has no gate, but that whosoever wills may enter therein, for he stands with open arms to admit us to His glory.” And again, when souls are perfectly puri-

the feast of the Resurrection this very hymn bursts forth in sudden exultation, and peals through the vaults of some vast basilica, when the deacon is about to sing of the earthquake, and the riven rock, and the triumph of the risen Saviour. Then the veils fall from every painting and statue, and the light from the long-shrouded windows suddenly pours its full glory on the uncovered images of our Lady and the saints, now smiling upon us in the joy of Eastertide. Was the Mass of Holy Saturday in Dante's thoughts when he made the mountain of purification quiver at the *Gloria in excelsis* of the liberated souls, as the last veil falls which shrouds from them the face of God?

The virtue which purifies and beautifies the souls in purgatory flows from the Second Adam, who is there *purging His floor*, and who is likened in Holy Scripture to a refiner's fire; but there, as here, He works by the ministry of angels, and, as it seems, specially by the ministry of the angels who wait in the presence-chamber of that glorious Queen, to whom S. Francis first gave the beautiful name of *Mary of the Angels*—the spirits whom Dante calls *Angeli del grembo de Maria*.\* (*Purg.* viii. 37.)

On the first step of the ascent which leads from each circle to the next stands a radiant angel representing the presence of the Incarnate God, and consoling the suffering souls by the symbols of His Divine Person. Their arms are outspread to typify His loving Humanity, and their extended wings symbolize His Divinity by which it is upborne. And thus they wait to receive each soul as it passes from one stage of purification to another, greeting it in the words of the Beatitude which specially belongs to the virtue there purified and perfected. They stand as they speak the glad tidings—

Quinci si va chi vuol andar per pace † (*Purg.* xxiv. 141)—

as the deacon stands when he chants the Gospel, in the attitude of Evangelists proclaiming the Gospel of peace. A sitting posture bespeaks authority, and the only angel who is

fied, "they become impassible, because there is nothing left to be consumed. And if in this state of purity they were kept in the fire they would feel no pain; rather it would be to them a fire of Divine love burning unhindered like the fire of life eternal."—Chap. viii. 10.

\* From Mary's bosom both of them have come,  
As guardians of the valley.—*Longfellow*.

† This way goes he who goeth after peace.—*Longfellow*.



seated in purgatory is he who sits beside the gate holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven, majestic as the white-robed angel of the resurrection who sat upon the unsealed stone which had covered the sepulchre of Christ.

We have now to follow our author through the several circles wherein the vestiges of the seven capital sins are purged away—the *vestiges left by pride, envy, anger, and the rest*; for in those holy souls there dwells neither pride, nor anger, nor any other evil thing, though, by an inaccuracy of expression which is never without injurious consequences, many of Dante's commentators convey an erroneous idea on this subject.

First and lowest in the scale of purification are the souls doing penance for the eldest primal sin of pride. And as when on earth they carried their heads erect and defied God and their fellows, so now they bend under the weight of immense masses of rock. They weep as they pass on in their slow and sorrowful procession, and in their weeping seem to say *Piu non posso* (x. 139)—“I can no more”—they who once vainly trusted in themselves that they could do all things. And painfully do they lift their eyes to the beautiful examples of humility sculptured in white marble on the mountain-side above them, while they trample under foot, engraved on the pavement beneath, every conceivable form of pride, from Lucifer falling like lightning from heaven to a miserable creature who betrayed her husband for the love of a piece of womanish finery.

First in humility, as in all other virtues, is she whose lowliness drew down the Most High from heaven. The hard marble yields itself like wax to express her sweetness and humility, as if in contrast with the more than marble obduracy of pride. She is sculptured at that moment which presented the three most sublime acts of humility which can be conceived—the humility of the Divine Word, who became incarnate in her womb; the humility of her who, in the act of becoming the Mother of the Word, called herself His hand-maid; the humility of the angel who bent his knee to a woman as to his queen.

L' Angel che venne in terra col decreto  
Della molt' anni lagrimata pace,  
Ch' aperse il Ciel dal suo lungo divieto,

Dinanzi a noi pareva s' i verace,  
Quivi intagliato in un alto soave,  
Che non sembiava imagine che tace.

Giurato si saria ch' ei dicess': *Ave*,  
 Perchè quivi era imaginata Quella  
 Ch' ad aprir l' alto amor volse la chiave ;  
 Ed avea in atto impressa esta favella,  
*Ecce ancilla Dei*, si propriamente,  
 Come figura in cera si suggella.\*—x. 34, 48.

The poor Maiden of Nazareth and crowned Queen of heaven is followed by two earthly monarchs, both of whom rose from a low estate to the regal dignity—David, in the act by which he drew upon himself the contempt of his haughty wife when he danced in the joy of his heart before the ark of God ; and Trajan, staying his victorious legions to redress the wrong of a poor oppressed peasant woman.

The penitents of the first circle recite the Paternoster, the most sublime and the lowliest of prayers, for it was taught by the mouth of the Man-God, who was also the humblest of men, and is daily recited and taught and learnt by simple women and children, from whom these once proud spirits are learning to become like little children, that so they may enter the royal palace which is the centre of the Kingdom of God.

As the heavenly guardian of the first circle appears we recognize at a glance the angel of humility. There is something that awes and dazzles in the glorious aspect of the other presiding spirits, but here we have the tremulous light of the morning star veiling itself before the rising dawn.

A noi venia la creatura bella,  
 Bianco-vestita, e nella faccia quale  
 Par tremolando mattutina stella.†—xii. 88, 90.

And the words with which he greets the souls, now delivered from the burden which pride had laid upon their shoulders, as

\* The Angel, who came down to earth with tidings  
 Of peace, that had been wept for many a year,  
 And opened heaven from its long interdict,  
 In front of us appeared so truthfully  
 There sculptured in a gracious attitude,  
 He did not seem an image that is silent.  
 One would have sworn that he was saying, "Ave,"  
 For she was there in effigy portrayed  
 Who turned the key to ope the exalted love,  
 And in her mien this language had impressed,  
 "Ecce ancilla Dei," as distinctly  
 As any figure stamps itself in wax.—*Longfellow*.

† Towards us came the being beautiful  
 Vested in white, and in his countenance  
 Such as appears the tremulous morning star.—*Longfellow*.

they pass on to a higher stage of purification—*Beati pauperes spiritu*—harmonize with the key-note struck by the humblest of God's creatures at the entrance of this school of humility: *Quia respexit humilitatem ancillæ suæ: ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes.*

Envy, as its derivation\* shows, is an abuse of the sense of sight. It is to look with an evil eye on the good of others, and in the *Purgatorio* it is fitly punished by blindness. The souls who are doing penance for this sin have their eyes closed by an iron wire. They wept not on earth over the sorrows of their fellows, and now that they would fain weep continually, the tears have to force their painful way through the sealed eyelids. They are clothed in penitential grey, to denote the livid colour of envy, and are scarcely distinguishable from the grey rock against which they lean, as they sit like the poor mendicants at the church-doors. They who once abused the gift of sight are hardly visible to the eye, and each rests his head wearily on the supporting shoulder of his neighbour: they thus mutually exercise the brotherly charity in bearing *one another's burthens* which they had neglected to fulfil on earth.

Their points of meditation are given by angelic voices, recording, in sweet or terrible accents, examples of blessed charity or of accursed envy. And first those sweet words of Mary fall upon our ear which, to supply a trifling need—to avert a little mortification—hastened the hour of her Divine Son's first miracle—*Vinum non habent.*

Everso noi volar furon sentiti,  
Non però visti, spiriti, parlando  
Alla mensa d'amor cortesi inviti.

La prima voce che passò volando,  
*Vinum non habent*, altamente disse,  
E dietro noi l'andò reiterando.†—*Purg. xiii. 24-30.*

The wine granted at the prayer of Mary is (as S. Bernard tells us) a figure of the virtue of charity, in which these souls were wanting upon earth. "O Lady," he says, "*Vinum non*

\* *Invideo*, from *in* and *video*.

† And tow'rds us there were heard to fly, albeit  
They were not visible, spirits uttering  
Unto love's table courteous invitations.

The first voice that passed onward in its flight,  
"*Vinum non habent*," said in accents loud,  
And went reiterating it behind us.—*Longfellow.*

*habent* ;—that wine which gladdens the heart of man is needful for us. Thou hast in thy hand the chalice of the wine of Divine love ; say, O Lady of all things in heaven and on earth, say for us to thy Son, *Vinum non habent.*”\* And the angels whose office it is to bring home to the souls once deficient in charity the words uttered by their Queen on earth bid them in her name to the sweet banquet of love.

Next follows the name of Orestes, the pattern of the highest form of love attained by the natural man, the generous love which would die for a friend ; and then the precept, *Love them from whom you have received evil*—the new command of Him who was delivered to death by envy, and gave His life for His envious enemies.

The examples of envy are Cain, wandering forth under the curse of his brother's blood, and Aglauro transformed into a rock by envy of a sister.

The prayer in this circle is the Litany of the Saints, to enlarge and gladden the hearts of the penitents by the thought of that communion in all heavenly joys which throughout eternity intensifies the bliss of charity, whereas envy withers at the sight of a single sharer of its miserable earthly goods.

The light reflected by the angel of fraternal charity from the face of the Man-God dazzles the eyes of the poet, who is fain to shade them with his hands from the exceeding glory. By the words *Beati misericordes* he points to those tender and loving acts of charity for the sufferings of others which are most directly opposed to the sin of envy.

The smoke which issues from the fire consists of those particles which have no power to give forth light or heat, and which must be rejected before the flame can burst forth in its brightness. The souls which once suffered the fire of charity to be quenched or dimmed by anger or revenge are doomed, in the third circle, to wander darkling in a cloud of dense and stifling smoke which hinders them from seeing or being seen.

The subjects of meditation are here suggested by visions of meekness and peace, proposed immediately to the imagination. Here Mary appears at the moment when she found her lost Child, after three days of anguish, which no heart less sensitive than hers could either conceive or endure. No shadow of reproach is on her lips ; only a humble question and a loving representation, first of S. Joseph's sorrow, then of her own : *Behold Thy Father and I have sought Thee sorrowing.*

---

\* In *Salve Reg.*

Ivi mi paroe in una visione  
 Estatica di subito esser tratto,  
 E vedeva in un tempo più persone :  
 Ed una donna in su l' entrar, con atto  
 Dolce di madre, dicer ; *Figliuol mio,*  
*Perchè hai tu così verso noi fatto ?*  
*Ecco, dolenti lo tuo padre ed io*  
*Ti cercavamo.\*—Purg. xv. 85-92.*

What a lesson to wrathful men, in whose thoughts their own wrongs and sufferings ever cast the sorrow of others into the shade ! What a support and consolation to these penitent souls, who, in the thick darkness, are sorrowfully seeking Jesus, from that sweet Mother's patience under the three days' loss ! Then follow an example of magnanimous forbearance in the heathen Pisistratus, overlooking the error of a friend ; and the heroic charity of the first Christian martyr, who died praying for his enemies.

Philomela, Aman, and Amata, three miserable souls, destroyed and destroying by the sin of anger, close the series of subjects for meditation.

The prayer of these souls, once full of anger and burning for revenge, rises to the Lamb of God, the merciful King, the Prince of Peace, the Victim of anger, who, turning the wrath of man to His praise, *made justice and peace to kiss each other.*

Io sentia voci, e cias-cuna pareva  
 Pregar per pace e per misericordia  
 L' Agnel di Dio, che le peccata leva.  
 Pure *Agnus Dei* eran le loro esordia :  
 Una parola in tutti era ed un modo,  
 Si che pareva tra esse ogni concordia.†—*Purg. xvi. 16-22.*

\* There it appeared to me that in a vision  
 Ecstatic on a sudden I was wrapt,  
 And in a temple many persons saw ;  
 And at the door a woman, with the sweet  
 Behaviour of a mother, saying, " Son,  
 Why in this manner has thou dealt with us ?  
 " Lo, sorrowing, thy Father and myself  
 Were seeking for thee."—*Longfellow.*

† Voices I heard, and every one appeared  
 To supplicate for peace and misericord  
 The Lamb of God who takes away our sins.  
 Still *Agnus Dei* their exordium was ;  
 One word there was in all, and metre one,  
 So that all harmony appeared among them.

—*Longfellow.*

*Una parola—un modo—ogni concordia* : not only is the intention of their prayer the same, but the words in which it is expressed, and the mode or tone in which it is chanted. All is now peace and concord in these hearts, once full of discord—concord which cancels every remaining effect of anger.

A sudden light flashes across the poet's eyes, dimmed with the heavy smoke ; the wings of the angel of peace fan his cheek, and he rises to the next circle of purification, with the words *Beati pacifici* in his ear.

Sloth is defined by S. Thomas as a "sadness or weariness of spiritual or internal good." In this wide sense it stands opposed to the love of God, as envy to the love of our neighbour, and would seem to deserve to be placed at the very base of the mountain of purification, rather than midway up the ascent. It is, in fact, for the punishment of sloth in this large and general sense that Dante has imagined his *Ante-Purgatorio*.

The souls in the fourth circle are purified from the vestiges of sloth, as it constitutes a special vice—viz., sadness and weariness in the spiritual exercises required by the evangelical law for the ordinary service of God. The souls who were once negligent and torpid in this service are here condemned to swift and ceaseless movement. They rest not day nor night. They run, not singly, but in a closely compact body, to signify the benefit of holy emulation and holy companionship. They encircle the mountain in a ceaseless round, which seems to have neither beginning nor end—a lesson to the slothful who shrink from setting their hand to work, and when begun never bring their work to a conclusion.

In the fourth circle the subject of the meditation is given out by the penitents themselves—two souls who precede the rest commemorating the glorious examples of diligence, whilst two who follow after proclaim shameful instances of sloth. The first cry of the forerunners celebrates the charitable haste of our Lady's visit to S. Elizabeth.

Maria corse con fretta alla montagna.\*—*Purg.* xvii. 160.

And all the rest excite each other to follow her, crying as they run—

Ratto, ratto, che il tempo non si perda  
Per poco amor.†

\* Mary in haste unto the mountain ran.—*Longfellow*.

† Quick ! quick ! so that the time may not be lost  
By little love.—*Longfellow*.



For these souls, who by an incessant, swift course, contemplating heaven the while, are purifying themselves from former remissness in the spiritual race, no fitter example could be found than hers whom the Church sets before us as combining in her own person the perfections both of the active and the contemplative life; nor could any passage in her history come home to them with such consoling power as the mystery of the Visitation. As they wend their weary way around the sacred mountain, whose summit they are not worthy yet to reach, they meditate on that royal Maiden speeding over the mountain-tops in the freshness of the early dawn, all nature paying her homage, and the Spirit of God impelling her free virginal step, made lighter by the Divine burden which she bears, as, "bearing Him by whom she is upborne,"\* she rests not till she reaches the summit of the sacred mount of Hebron.

"The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light;" and next to the peaceful heavenly diligence of Mary follows the tumultuous vehement energy of a conqueror—the lightning-path of Cæsar, who in a few short months made himself the master of Italy and Spain.

The examples of miserable sloth are taken from the ancestors of Mary and of Cæsar—the Hebrews who perished in the desert, and saw not the promised land (the type of the heavenly kingdom); and the companions of Æneas, who loitered in Sicily and never touched the Latin shore, on which was to arise the Empire of the World.

No vocal prayer is uttered by the penitents in the fourth circle. Perhaps this consolation is denied them as a penalty for their former remissness in prayer, that they may better understand that the sublimest privilege of man is to be permitted to converse with God. Perhaps continual recollection in mental prayer, and the tears which accompany it, are to take the place of vocal prayer with those who are doing penance for former distractions and tepidity. Perhaps the poet intended to show that the recitation of the choral office of the Church is but a species of idleness when the body is at ease and the thoughts far away from God. This idea is suggested by the fact that the only name mentioned in this circle is that of a monk (the Abbot of S. Zeno), specially bound by his vocation to diligence in prayer.

The angel of the love of God presides over this circle, and, to indicate his fervent zeal, loving diligence, and ardent charity towards God, his gleaming, outspread white wings alone are

---

\* Serm. in Domin. infra Octav. Assumpt.

visible, pointed upwards to the stair, as he pronounces the Beatitude upon those who mourn.

*Qui lugent* affermando esser beati,  
Ch' avran di consolar l' anime donne.\*—*Purg.* xix. 50, 51.

A difficult and mournful path awaits Dante in the fifth circle, where he has to thread his way amid prostrate forms, expiating by this humiliating penance their former sins of avarice.

Quel ch' avarizia fa, qui si dichiara  
In purgazion dell' anime converse,  
E nulla pena il monte ha più amara.

Si come l' occhio nostro non s' aderse  
In alto, fisso alle cose terrene,  
Così giustizia qui a terra il merse.

Come avarizia spense a ciascun bene  
Lo nostro amore, onde operar perdèsi,  
Così guestizia qui strette ne tiene,

Ne' piedi e nelle man legati e presi ;  
E quanto fia piacer del giusto Sire,  
Tanto staremo immobili e distesi.†—*Purg.* xix. 118, etc.

They are compelled to fix their eyes continually on the earth, where they once laid up their treasures. They are pressed down by an invisible burden, and bound hand and feet by invisible bonds, fettering the hands which they once refused to stretch forth to the poor, and the feet which moved not to visit the sick and the prisoners in their suffering and captivity. Thus motionless and prostrate, they await the moment of their deliverance in humble meditation on the blessedness of the poor.

\* Affirming those *qui lugent* to be blessed,  
For they shall have their souls with comfort filled.—*Longfellow.*

† What avarice does is here made manifest  
In the purgation of these souls converted,  
And no more bitter pain the mountain has.

Even as our eye did not uplift itself  
Aloft, being fastened upon earthly things,  
So justice here has merged it in the earth.

As avarice had extinguished our affection  
For every good, whereby was action lost,  
So justice here doth hold us in restraint,

Bound and imprisoned by the feet and hands ;  
And so long as it pleases the just Lord  
Shall we remain immovable and prostrate.—*Longfellow.*

And first, one of the rich and mighty men of earth, the founder of a right royal dynasty, thus celebrates the poverty of Bethlehem :—

Eper ventura udii : Dolce Maria !  
 Dinanzi a noi chiamar così nel pianto,  
 Come fa donna che in partorir sia ;

E seguitar : *Povera fosti tanto,*  
*Quanto veder si può per quell' ospizio,*  
*Ove sponesti il tuo portato santo.*

Queste parole m' eran si piaciute,  
 Ch' i' mi trassi oltre, per aver contezza  
 Di quello spirito onde parean venute.\*—*Purg. xix. 20.*

It is Hugh Capet, who calls upon the kings and queens of earth to bow before the manger where the Queen of Angels offers the new-born King of heaven and earth to the adoration of His creatures. Here the Divine poverty, which received from the Magi a tribute of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, receives a tribute of humiliation, prayer, and tears from souls once enslaved by avarice. The *poverty by which we were made rich* gives the last purifying touch to hearts once overcome by the riches which impoverish the soul. And Mary, as she lays her helpless Babe in that narrow crib, seems to relieve the painful posture of these prostrate souls. As they kiss the poor swathing bands which fetter the hands and feet of the Omnipotent, their own bonds are eased.

The incorruptible integrity of the noble Roman Fabricius, and the Christian liberality of the holy bishop S. Nicolas of Myra, are set forth as patterns to civil governors, and to prelates of the Church. The examples of the virtues opposed to avarice are the subject of the day's meditation. By night the penitents muse with sorrow and holy indignation upon seven different examples of the sin of avarice, answering to the seven accursed daughters whom S. Thomas assigns to this vice—treason, fraud, deceit, violence, perjury, inhumanity, and disquiet of soul.

The prayer which rises from these prostrate souls denotes

---

\* And I peradventure heard "Sweet Mary!"  
 Uttered in front of us amid the weeping,  
 Even as a woman does who is in child-birth ;

And in continuance : "How poor thou wast  
 Is manifested by that hostelry  
 Where thou didst lay thy sacred Burden down."

So pleasurable were these words to me  
 That I drew forward, onward to have knowledge  
 Touching that spirit whence they seemed to come.

—*Longfellow.*

their former sin, and the penance by which they are now making expiation for it :—

*Adhæsit pavimento anima mea,*  
Sentir dir lor con sì alti sospiri,  
Che la parola a pena s' intendea.—xiv. 73-75.

*Beati qui sitiunt justitiam* is the Beatitude pronounced by the angel of justice, showing the sublime and truly Christian sense in which Dante understood the word. According to its etymology, justice signifies equality, or that which corresponds to a rule or model. In pagan writers it signifies to give to every man his due. But when the Gospel came to reunite the Creator with the creature, and to propose the will of God as the model or rule of human action, justice came to signify, not only the giving to every man his due, but the giving to God what is due to Him. It came to include, not only abstinence from fraud and rapine, or resignation to involuntary poverty, but the charity of almsgiving and the free choice of religious poverty. The blessing of the angel of justice falls, therefore, both upon poverty and liberality, for both are included in the evangelical virtue of justice.

The punishment of the souls who in the sixth circle do penance for the sins of gluttony is that of the fabled Tantalus. Fainting with hunger and parched with thirst, they pass in unbroken silence between two trees laden with delicious fruit, at whose roots bubbles forth a fountain of sparkling water. Both water and fruit elude their touch.

Our Lady at the marriage-feast of Cana is once more proposed by a voice amid the leaves of the first tree, as the subject of meditation in her loving care for others and forgetfulness of self :—

Li duo poeti all' alber s' appressaro :  
Ed una voce per entro le fronde  
Gridò : *Di questo cibo avrete caro !*  
Poi disse : *Più pensava Maria, onde*  
*Fosser le nozze orrevoli ed intere.*  
*Ch' alla sua bocca ch' or per voi risponde.*†—xxii. 139-144.

\* “ *Adhæsit pavimento anima mea,*”  
I heard them say with sighings so profound  
That hardly could the words be understood.— *Longfellow.*

† The poets twain unto the tree drew near,  
And from among the foliage a voice  
Cried, “ Of this food ye shall have scarcity.”

Then said, “ More thoughtful Mary was of making  
The marriage-feast complete and honourable,  
Than of her mouth, which now for you responds.”

“ Mary,” cries the mysterious voice, “ thought not of herself, but of others, and the virgin lips which never opened to the enjoyment of earthly food are now opened for you before God, and thus hasten your purification.”

A voice from the other tree records the sin of Eve :—

*Trapassate oltre, senza farvi presso ;  
Legno è più su, che fu morso da Eva,  
E questa pianta si levò da esso.*

Si tra le fronde non so chi diceva.\*—*Purg.* xxiv. 115-118.

Mary is here proposed to us, not only as the most temperate of creatures, but, as the mother of the Fruit of the tree of life, she is contrasted with Eve, from whom we received the fruit of death. Two feasts are spread before the penitents—the one, amid the flowers of Eden, soon to be changed into thorns and briars ; the other, amid the poor water-jars of Cana, soon to be filled with the life-giving wine. At one we see Adam and Eve, at the other Jesus and Mary—Eve drawing from the forbidden tree the poison which destroys every holy affection, and Mary bringing forth from the true vine wine which regenerates and sanctifies love. There we see the beginning of the fall of man ; here the acceleration of the hour of his resurrection.

The unknown voice from the first tree praises the sobriety of the ancient Roman women, the abstinence of Daniel, the frugality of the Age of Gold, and the austerity of the holy Baptist.

As we leave the circle we hear from the second tree of the gluttony of the Centaurs and the softness of Gedeon's rejected warriors. The lips which on earth were open to the vile pleasures of taste now open only to praise the Lord. They chant tearfully, *Domine, labia mea aperies, et os meum annuntiabit laudem tuam*, in memory of the first Adam, and of the Second, who said “ Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God.” They fast and pray till every vestige of their former sin has been effaced ; and as they pass the two forbidden trees they meditate upon the tree of the Cross, and upon Him who there changed corporal thirst into the supernatural thirst of love.

The angel of abstinence, whose countenance glows like metal heated sevenfold in the furnace, and who scatters from

\* Pass farther onward without drawing near ;  
The tree of which Eve ate is higher up,  
And out of that one has this tree been raised.

Thus said I know not who among the branches.—*Longfellow.*

his wings a fragrance like the May breeze impregnated with flowers, recalls to mind the mighty and benignant Spirit who watched over the fasting of the royal youths in Babylon, and walked with them through the sevenfold-heated furnace, making a light air to breathe upon its flames, so that they harmed them not:—

Drizzai la testa per verder chi fossi,  
E giammai non si videro in fornace  
Vetri o metalli sì lucenti e rossi,

Com' i' vidi un che dicea : " S' a voi piace  
Montare in su, qui si convien dar volta ;  
Quinci si va chi vuole andar per pace."

\* \* \* \* \*

E quale, annunziatrice degli albori,  
L' aura di maggio muovesi ed olezza,  
Tutta impregnata dall' erba e da' fiori ;

Tal mi senti' un vento dar per mezza  
La fronte, e ben senti' mover la piuma  
Che fe' sentir d' ambrosia l' orezza.\*—xxiv. 136.

We are now drawing near the terrestrial paradise, which is girdled round by the fire of Divine Justice, like the cherub's flaming sword, suffering none to enter till they have been purified from the last vestige of carnal affections. An air, like that wafted from the wings of the sixth angel, rises from the circle below, where the silent souls do penance in fasting and prayer, and, driving the flames upward, leaves a narrow pathway along the brink free for the poet's steps.

The penitents, who in the seventh circle expiate offences against holy purity, are divided into two bands, which move through the purifying flames in opposite directions. As they

---

\* I raised my head to see who this might be,  
And never in a furnace was there seen  
Metals or glass so lucent and so red,

As one I saw who said, " If it may please you  
To mount aloft, here it behoves you turn ;  
This way goes he who goeth after peace."

\* \* \* \* \*

And as, the harbinger of early dawn,  
The air of May doth move and breathe out fragrance,  
Impregnate all with herbage and with flowers,

So did I feel a breeze strike in the midst  
My front, and felt the moving of the plumes  
That breathed around an odour of ambrosia.

—Longfellow.



meet they pause for an instant to exchange the kiss of peace, in token of the pure and holy charity which has now replaced all earthly affections, and then pass on to pursue their pilgrimage of fire till all remaining dross has been burnt away. Their meditations are mingled with vocal prayers. In suppressed and mournful accents they intone the Church's matin hymn for Saturday, *Summæ Deus clementiæ*, and at the close of each verse a single voice proclaims aloud, in a tone which thrills through the whole abode of penance, *Virum non cognosco* :—

*Summæ Deus clementiæ*, nel seno  
Del grande ardore, allora udii cantando.

\* \* \* \* \*

Appresso il fine ch' a quell' inno fassi,  
Gridavan alto : *Virum non cognosco* :  
Indi ricominciavan l' inno bassi.

Finitolo, anche gridavano. . . . \*—*Purg.* xxv. 121.

A marvellous dialogue ! in which one voice sustains the part of the ineffable type of that purity which the penitents are labouring to impress upon themselves, while the low mournful voice of the response acknowledges how far they are yet from its attainment. They would hide themselves in the shrouding flames as in the secret chamber of Nazareth, where God alone and angels converse with the maiden who hesitated to accept the dignity of Mother of God till assured that her virginal purity should remain in its immaculate integrity. Thus in the seventh circle, as in the first, to souls nearest to their perfect purification, as to those just entering on their penance, the image of Mary, in her humility and purity, falls like a shower of moonlight on the dark waves of penitential sorrow. Her *Ecce ancilla Domini* sanctified and lightened the burdens of the first ; her *Virum non cognosco* hallows, while it intensifies, the furnace of pain and shame which purifies the last. The image of Mary's purity and Mary's humility begins and completes the expiation by which the souls are made meet for heaven.

Then follow afar off other examples of innocence and chastity, but separated from that of the Virgin Mother by the

---

\* "*Summæ Deus clementiæ*," in the bosom  
Of the great burning chanted then I heard,  
\* \* \* \* \*

After the close which to that hymn is made,  
Aloud they shouted, "*Virum non cognosco*" ;  
Then recommenced the hymn with voices loud.

—Longfellow.

whole interval of the hymns ; while shameful instances of the opposite vice are named by the penitents as they meet for their brief greeting in the heart of the fire, thus exciting in these spirits, now perfectly pure, a shame and abhorrence far keener and more searching than the torture of the material fire. The angel of purity stands at eventide on the shore of the burning sea, and welcomes the enfranchised souls with the Beatitude, *Beati mundo corde* :—

Fuor della fiamma stava in su la riva,  
E cantava, *Beati mundo corde*,  
In voce, assai più che la nostra, viva.\*

—*Purg.* xxvii. 7-9.

We are conscious that, from lack of space, and still more from lack of ability, we have failed to do anything like justice to this profound and beautiful commentary upon the most touching, and perhaps the most instructive portion of Dante's great poem. Father Perez's work is indeed a poem in itself, as well as a manual of deeply practical theology. A kindred devotion in his own heart has enabled him to bring out with singular power and beauty a feature of the *Purgatorio* which throws a touching light upon the depths of Dante's noble yet troubled spirit—his intense and tender devotion to Mary :—

*Vergine Madre*  
*Umile ed alta più che creatura.*

If the present essay is (as its author leads us to hope) only part of a whole, hereafter to be completed, we trust that he will one day unfold to us the glories of Mary's presence-chamber in the *Paradiso*, where Gabriel on outspread wings chants his eternal *Ave* before her throne,† where S. Anne, as she bears her part in the universal hosanna, never turns her eyes from the face of her child,‡ and where Mary herself, on the throne of heaven as in the stable of Bethlehem, exercises her mother's office by manifesting Jesus to all faithful souls, and preparing

\* Outside the flame he stood upon the verge,  
And chanted forth, "*Beati mundo corde*,"  
In voice by far more living than our own.—*Longfellow*.

† E quell' Amor, che primo li discese  
Cantando : *Ave Maria, gratia plena*,  
Dinanzi a lei sue ali distese.—*Paradiso*, xxxii. 94.

‡ Vede sedere Anna,  
Tanto contenta di mirar sua figlia  
Che non muove occhio per contare Osanna.  
—*Ibid.* xxxii. 133.

them by loving contemplation of the face most like His own to look upon the unveiled vision of God, thus fulfilling the longing prayer of Eve's poor banished children—

*Jesum benedictum Fructum ventris tui  
Nobis post hoc exilium ostende.*

Reguarda omai nella faccia ch' a Cristo  
Più s' assomiglia ; che la sua chiarezza  
Sola ti può disporre a veder Cristo.

—*Paradiso*, xxxii. 85.

The original intention of F. Perez was to add to his work a notice of the historical personages introduced by Dante into his *Purgatorio*, and of the political events of the times in which they lived, but he was compelled to relinquish the attempt by the very richness and variety of the materials which accumulated under his hand, and which would have disturbed the conception and feeling of the unity and harmony of the subject, which he wished above all things to impress upon the mind of his readers. He is preparing, as he tells us, by a fuller and deeper study of the historical documents now at the command of modern inquirers, to complete and perfect his work. The excellence of the portion now before us leads us earnestly to desire that he may be enabled to carry out his design.

There is much interesting and useful matter in the notes and illustrations to Longfellow's translation of the *Divina Commedia*, which we have used in the foregoing article, but they have been selected for the most part from writers who, from the prejudices of education or from other causes, have failed to penetrate beyond the surface of this great Catholic poem, or fully to appreciate the character of its author. An exception must be made in favour of some noble passages from Carlyle's "Hero Worship."

The translation itself is a great boon to readers unacquainted or imperfectly acquainted with the original language of Dante. It is wonderfully faithful, in many passages almost literal, yet very seldom meagre or flat. It gives Dante's meaning with his own brief and abrupt precision. The exquisite beauty of the medium by which, in the original, this meaning is conveyed, the translator has not attained, for it is unattainable. He has wisely, we think, forbore to venture upon the sublime simplicity of Dante's *terza rima*, and no less wisely has he refrained from attempting a metrical paraphrase, which would have been no difficult task to the author of "Evangeline."

He has revered his author too much to mingle anything of his own with the severe fidelity of his version. His work which, as yet, comprises only the *Inferno* and the *Purgatorio*, will be, we hope, soon completed by the appearance of the *Paradiso*.

---

## ART. VII.—RITUALISTIC DIVINITY AND LAW.

*Tracts for the Day: Essays on Theological Subjects, by various Authors.*  
 Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans,  
 Green, & Co.

*Strictures on the Judgment of the Court of Appeal in the Case of  
 "Martin v. Mackonochie."* By JOHN DAND CHAMBERS, M.A., Re-  
 corder of Salisbury. London: Church Press Company, 13, Burleigh  
 Street, Strand.

WE have read this volume with mingled feelings, that of pity being predominant. Had it been the first production of its kind that fell under our eyes, wonder, no doubt, or rather perplexity, would have been blended with the gentler emotion. To see a band of earnest, learned, accomplished men taking their stand on a few long-dead and obsolete fragments of a Protestant Liturgy, and stoutly proclaiming to the world that a vast mass of the very doctrines and usages which formed the alleged grounds on which the English Established Church separated from Rome are nevertheless the real doctrines and approved usages of the Church; to see, moreover, this same band holding their system to be true and divine, yet clinging to the communion which utterly abjures it, and not only refusing to enter that in which it is a living reality, but pouring out scalding invectives on those of their fellows who do enter—these are surely phenomena, which would strike one observing them for the first time as strange, inexplicably strange. Yet it is not only an old story, but a story of daily and universal recurrence.

Within the Church sinners are being every day converted from a state of sin to a state of sanctity: once yielding to the first impulse of grace, they yield to the second and the third, and so on, till the great work is consummated. Others resist from the first doggedly and persistently, until at length they become blinded and hardened. Others yield for a time, longer or shorter, but midway turn back; for whom, perhaps, a happier day may come—as for many of them it has come—

perhaps it may never come. Others, again, yield on and on to the continued impressions of grace, until they come to the last step, and, having but that to make, yet stop there: some devil's whisper having been hotly breathed into their ear, or some devil's obstacle having been craftily flung in their way—a sudden call to business, which might well have been deferred; a sudden sorrow, which, so far from becoming a hindrance, might well have been turned to present account; the sudden approach of an old companion in sin, who might well have been avoided, or recoiled from, or repelled; and such like.

The operations of divine grace on sinners within the Church, in turning them to holiness, exactly resemble in all essential points the operations of the same grace, in drawing into her pale those who are without. How many thorough conversions of this kind have been brought about in our own generation we all know. The often quoted saying of S. Ambrose, "*Nescit tarda molimina Spiritûs Sancti gratia*,"\* is indisputably true not only of the conversion of sinners into just, but of the conversion of non-Catholics into Catholics. Yet, in the ordinary ways of God, conversions of the latter kind are not sudden; and even in cases that seem to be such, there has been going on a process of interior, unseen illumination, not suspected even by the individuals themselves; a gradual softening of the heart, perhaps for years, before the final *Credo*, expelling every shadow of doubt, takes full possession of the soul, and passes thence into outward and open profession on the lips. On the other hand, and coming under a directly opposite category, there have been persons who, like the bishop whose strange avowal occasioned the conversion of the Abbé Edgeworth,† received the grace of actual

---

\* L. ii. in Luc. n. 19.

† The anecdote, which is given in England's "*Life of the Abbé*" (London: Longman, 1818, p. 6, &c.), is probably unknown to most of our readers. Some time, pretty early in the latter half of the last century, an Irish Protestant bishop had been travelling in France. During the course of his stay at Toulouse, he asked permission to be present at the celebration of High Mass. The request was cheerfully complied with, and he was accommodated with a seat in the sanctuary, just opposite the altar. As the solemn moment of consecration was approaching, the arguments he had formerly heard in favour of the Real Presence, together with the words used by our Lord in instituting the Blessed Eucharist, flashed at once with such vividness and force upon his mind that he instantly made an act of faith in that doctrine, and when in a few seconds the tinkling of the bell announced that the consecration had taken place, he fell prostrate to the earth in adoration of the sacred Host. Some time after his return to Ireland, he, in a conversation with Mr. Edgeworth (at the time rector of a parish), among other approvals of Catholic doctrine, told this extraordinary event, adding that 'he experienced at that moment a fervour of devotional feeling beyond all that in his life he

belief, and yet remained where they were, and died in the open profession of known error. Intermediate between the position of these two classes is that of the authors of the volume before us. They have been gradually led on to embrace nearly all the leading doctrines which distinguish the Catholic from the Protestant religion; and though, in their exposition of these doctrines, they often fall short of the true and full Catholic sense, and shroud their meaning in hazy and captious language, yet are they throughout at open war with both the spirit and the letter of the prevailing and genuine Protestant creed. They not only denounce this creed, but make a special triumph in denouncing and assailing it. They have even worked themselves into a kind of persuasion that they are Catholics, and they assume the name of Catholic, and say, "We Catholics," "Us Catholics." It is a beautiful name, a glorious title. How the proudest names that ever sounded in the ears of men sink into nothing at its utterance, and pale before its world-wide and ever undiminished splendour! It was the charmed word for the great Augustine, that "*nomen Catholicum*." We love them for loving it, we honour them for honouring it; and with all the fervour of our heart we hope and pray that a day may come, when—but as yet they are Protestants, and professed members of a Church which is decidedly anti-Catholic in fact, decidedly Protestant both in fact and in name.

---

had ever before thought possible. It was a day of happiness,' said he, 'and I shall never forget it.' Upon this Mr. Edgeworth asked the bishop whether he intended to take the further steps to which such an occurrence pointed. The latter replied 'that he had arrived at that period of life when, perhaps, it was too late to begin so lengthened and distressing an investigation. Moreover, he thought he filled too elevated and responsible a situation in the religious body to which he belonged, to trifle with doctrines, to the profession and support of which he had bound himself by the solemn obligation of an oath; and that, in fine, so long as his heart was influenced and directed by the opinions which he privately embraced, he saw no necessity for destroying the prospects of his family, and injuring himself, by giving them uncalled for publicity.'

Mr. Edgeworth, though a strong, and what would be called a bigoted Protestant, was a sincere and conscientious man. He immediately commenced a course of earnest and laborious inquiry, in due course joined the Catholic Church, fled to France from the face of the 'glorious, pious, and immortal' laws that then governed Ireland, and, after the suitable preparation, was ordained priest. The bishop received the grace, rejected it, lived on in his own way, and we know no more about him. The grace which he so abused was given to another, who received and obeyed it, was afterwards confessor to Louis XVI. at the time of his execution; and on Friday, May 22nd, in the year 1807, in the sixty-second year of his age, died of a nervous fever caught in attending a number of pestilence-stricken French soldiers, imprisoned at Mittau, in Russia, where Louis XVIII. then resided.



In all such cases there exists a delusion, from which, if not dispelled, issues that most dangerous of all the snares by which the great enemy of the human race not only entraps but secures the souls of men—a false conscience. What is the delusion in the present case? There may be many, but undoubtedly the principal one is the peculiar theory of branch Churches held by these gentlemen. Such a theory in the mouths of Low Church or Broad Church men might be so explained as to sound intelligible enough; some of them holding that Christ did not establish one universal Church, as a society strictly so called, but only established certain principles on which particular societies should be formed, all these making one body, not in union with each other, but in a certain general resemblance to each other; some holding that Christ merely revealed his religion to men, leaving individuals free to associate or not in the profession and practice of it; but all of them holding very lax, many holding extremely lax, opinions on the importance of dogmatic truth and unity of faith. Now our essayists utterly reject these systems and views as so many pestilent heresies. They hold that Christ did establish one Catholic Church, and that this Church still exists one and Catholic; indeed, their constant use of the phrase Catholic Church, and their constant reference to their own branch thereof, plainly and necessarily imply such belief. They hold that soundness of faith is a matter of vital importance, and that heresy is a deadly sin. They nowhere directly advocate the distinction so universally held by the various Protestant sects, according to which certain doctrines are, of their own intrinsic nature, essential to the being of a Church; while other doctrines, of their own nature also and irrespective of their being equally clearly revealed, are non-essential, and may be rejected by individuals without peril of salvation. This is the delusion by which they allow themselves to be duped into such fatal security. This is the veil upon their heart, which shuts out the clearest light of truth and fact. They believe that there is one true Catholic Church; they believe that it is necessary to belong to this Church, and that wilfully to remain out of it is a grievous sin; but then, they say, we belong to this Church, for it comprises three branches, the Roman, the Greek, and our own Anglican branch.

We are not now going to enter into a formal refutation of the theory. This has been accomplished long ago, over and over again, in the pages of the first series of this journal and in other publications—long ago, when Dr. Newman was king at Oxford, and when the theological gallery there presented its collection of waxworks, so cunningly fashioned to look like

life, but never uttering a living sound ; so speciously arrayed in the costume of truth, but never warmed by it with one vital glow of heat. These things were not the living body ; but they exhibited a likeness of its reality and beauty. It is all changed since then ; and where they once stood, in the dim and softened light, there stand now, in a cold, clammy, charnel-house gloom, the grinning skeletons of pantheism and atheism, naked, hideous and noisome,

Σμερδαλέ', εὐρωέντα, τὰ τε στυγέουσι θεοί περ.

*There* was the stronghold of the branch system, if it had a stronghold on earth ; and now, as in desolate Babylon, "wild beasts rest there, and ostriches dwell there, and the hairy ones dance there." *There* was the vineyard, in which that system would have flourished and bid defiance to decay, if it had in it the true sap of life ; and now "the boar out of the wood hath laid it waste, and a singular wild beast hath devoured it." While, through all these rolling years, the vine that was to "inherit the land for ever" has been buffeted on all sides, and by all the storms of heaven ; and has but struck its roots deeper, and stretched its tendrils farther, and borne richer and more abundant fruit.

We are not going to refute the branch theory ; but we note three things regarding it. The first is that, though tolerably well acquainted with the literature of the party, especially during the period of its greatest vigour, and ere yet its ranks had been broken by desertion or thinned by death, we have never met with anything that could be dignified with the name of proof for the theory. Mr. Palmer has attempted such proof in his *Treatise on the Church*, and he is almost the only one who has attempted it. But his statements of fact, as usual with him when he has a point to gain, are altogether perverted or utterly false ; while his arguments are weak even to silliness. The theory is the very corner-stone of the whole system of the essayists, especially as regards the constitution of the Church, and as such is often alluded to by them.\* One should therefore expect that particular pains would be taken to demonstrate its solidity ; but, so far is this from being the case,

We note secondly that, both in the volume before us and in the two preceding volumes, which have appeared under the name of the same editor, the subject seems to have been carefully excluded. The three volumes together contain just forty-two essays or tracts. Not one of these is devoted either in whole or in part to this all-important question ; nor can we

---

\* Pages 28, 114, 131, &c.

find that there is a single page in any one of them devoted to it. They are called "Essays on Questions of the Day," "Tracts for the Day." Surely this is not only one of the questions of the day, but, from the stand-point of the essayists, should be to them not only among the greatest questions of the day, but, alone and of itself, the greatest of them all—the very question whose true solution would lead directly to the solution of all the rest. "Poteram . . . omnes propositionum rivulos uno Ecclesiæ sole siccare," says St. Jerome.\* Yet our essayists have not opened a single avenue for this piercing light to enter. But it is part of that terrible delusion which soothes us to deepest rest on the very point on which we are least secure.

We note thirdly that, while, as our essayists well know, we absolutely and with one loud voice reject their branch theory as a most pernicious error, and that, while our theologians have produced arguments both Scriptural and Patristic overthrowing that theory, they nevertheless write on, as if unconscious that any such protest or any such array of argument existed. Nay, what is stranger still, they write on, professing themselves true members of the Established Church, as if unconscious of what all the world outside themselves sees so clearly—that they are a mere handful lurking in the pale of that Church; a mere tiny twig dangling from that branch, and joined to it but by a slender skin of external and word profession. The heart and soul and voice of that Church are not only not with them, but dead against them. Of the whole of their episcopate, English and Irish, is there even one whom they can call their own? Of the twenty thousand ministers, of the ten million of lay members, of the Church, how small a fraction are really and truly theirs! They hold, for example, seven sacraments, the Real Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice, the divine institution of confession. How many are there of the aforesaid bishops, clergy, and laity, who hold these doctrines: who do not hold that these doctrines are false, superstitious, and anti-Christian? Tell us not of scraps and cuttings from old paper creeds and rubrics, drawn up by certain assemblies three hundred years ago. Whatever they meant then, or may be made to mean now, is altogether irrelevant to the point at issue. We believe that the essayists put quite a forced and false meaning on the passages quoted by them to show what was the faith of their Church two or three centuries ago. But we will, for the present, waive this point, and, for short argument's sake, grant them all they ask on it. If holding, for example, the Real

---

\* *Dialogus adversus Luciferianos*, n. 28.

Presence, they maintain that they are true and sound members of the Anglican Church existing now, because certain parties in that Church, as existing three hundred years ago, held that doctrine, or wrote, or ruled, as if they held it then, with still greater right and more irresistible logic, could they, holding the Pope's supremacy, exactly and fully as we Catholics hold it, maintain that they are members of that now existing Church, because not only the whole Anglican, but the whole Western Church held this doctrine three hundred and fifty years ago? As all the world knows, Churches that were once Catholic became, in a generation or two, Arian, or Nestorian, or Monophysite. The Catholic Church lives for ever, always the same; but particular Churches may change, may die out and rot even into infidelity. The question is of a Church now living. I am not a member of any such Church, because I hold doctrines held in it or by it some centuries ago, if it be clear as the sun at noonday that the now existing Church no longer holds these doctrines. It is not a question of subtle investigation or antiquarian research; it is a question of existing *fact*, plain, palpable, and notorious. Does the Established Church of the present generation hold, or has that Church for many generations past held, the distinctive body of doctrine which our essayists profess? What she distinctly and definitely holds on many important points is doubtful enough; but that she does *not* hold this system is a fact as certain as human testimony can well make it. A Church is not an abstraction, nor is it a creed or formula printed in a book: it is a body of men, among other things, having a certain profession of faith; and it is a mere truism, or rather a mere tautology, to say that their professed belief is what they openly profess to believe. We would say, then, to our friends:—You are not of the Established Church, whether or not you would have been of it, as it existed three centuries ago, had you lived then and held the doctrines you hold now. You are in it, not of it; you are not true members of it, unless on some Broad Church principle, which you yourselves would be first and loudest in rejecting as downright heresy.

The essayist party is not by itself the Catholic Church, as the Donatists of old maintained themselves to be. No one has advanced a proposition so self-contradictory. They are not along with us and united to us of the Catholic Church. They do not hold an invisible Church, whose members are united together by invisible bonds of union; but a visible Church, whose members are united together by visible bonds. What are the visible ties that bind them and us together, so that “we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one

members one of another"?\* Are we both so one "that there should be no schism [or division] in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it"?† Do we both together make one "body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every part supplieth," or "the body by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together"?‡ Do we together make one holy kingdom, one city, one temple, one house, one sheepfold—titles and types by which the Church of Christ is so often described in the New Testament?

In those early ages, to which our essayists so often and so fondly refer, there were various bonds and signs of communion between the various branches of the Church, beside the special marks of communion with the mother trunk in Rome. There was the frequent interchange of letters, some dogmatic, others bearing other aspects and tokens of ecclesiastical intercommunion; there was the common gathering together and deliberation in general or particular councils; there were the mutual conferring or receiving of the sacraments, mutual benedictions, counsels, warnings, congratulations, and so forth. Does there now exist, has there ever existed, from the early days of Elizabeth down to the present moment, a single one of these marks of communion—even one, or the shadow of a shade of one—between the Bishops of the Establishment and any Catholic Bishops on the face of the earth; or between the members of the Establishment and the members of any Catholic Church on the face of the earth? If the Bishop of Orleans were to make a visit to London, would Dr. Jackson dream of inviting him to preach in any of his churches, or to perform any sacred function whatever in any of his churches, or outside any of them? And, if we make the absurd supposition that such invitation were given and accepted, and that Monseigneur Dupanloup did act on it, the very act would be by all Catholics (and, we presume, by all Protestants) taken at once as an act of open apostacy; that great luminary of the French Church would instantly fall, as Satan fell, like lightning, not only from the heaven of his renown, but from the authority of his see; and his place would be found no more in the ranks of the Catholic episcopate. Or, take the opposite picture: suppose one of the Bishops of the Establishment were

---

\* Rom. xii. 5. The texts in this paragraph are given as in the Protestant version.

† 1 Cor. xii. 25-6.

‡ Ephes. iv. 16; Coloss. ii. 19.

travelling abroad, and known as such, is there a single Catholic Bishop or priest in the world who, in any conceivable circumstances, would think of asking him to perform, or of permitting him to perform, the smallest sacred office inside or outside any house of worship? Not one. We may be united together by civil bonds, by social bonds, by bonds even of close friendship and enduring affection: but as ecclesiastical bodies, as Church members, if we be united in one, where are the ties that unite us? Our creeds are different; the principles of our creeds—our rules of faith—are different; our worships are different; our Church governments are different; our systems and principles of Church government are different. In these things that constitute Church unity, our sympathies are not their sympathies, our ways are not their ways, our thoughts are not their thoughts. Once we were all one: we are so no longer. Some geologists say there was a time when England was united to France; but,

Like cliffs that have been rent asunder,  
A dreary sea now flows between.

•

England is still near to France, and each coast may be seen from the other: the two people have much in common; but who would therefore say that the English and French people are one people, or that England and France make one kingdom?

Away, then, with this idle dream, unknown to the first fifteen centuries of the Church, unknown to this day out of a small circle in England. It is a "baseless fabric," without any foundation in Scripture, without any foundation in the tradition of the Church or the usages of the Church, without any foundation in harmonious theory or in solid fact. A mere idea, fancy-born and fancy-fed, it resembles one of the snow-men fashioned by the sorcerer in Thalaba, and melts away before the calm reflection and keen scrutiny which the sober night-time of thought brings with it. But, above all, it is, we again repeat, a perilous delusion, smoothing pillows that should be couches of unrest and alarm; hushing the voice of uneasy consciences; lulling the pulses of agitated hearts. It is a blind delusion, leading its blind victims astray—perhaps on, on to that precipice, down which whoso falls is lifted up no more.

In reviewing a work of this sort, it would be impossible to go through a running commentary on its varied and ample contents; approving what we think sound and true, refuting what we think unsound and false. The utmost that can be



expected from us is to give a specimen of its spirit and execution. For this purpose we select the leading essay, which, in its subject, is also the most interesting and important, giving a few of the thoughts and reflections which occurred to us in its perusal. It is entitled, "Priestly Absolution : Scriptural," and covers nearly fifty pages.

In pages 2, 3, we have the following accurate account of the Protestant theory of the remission of sin, which, when noticing Dr. O'Brien's Lectures on Justification, we so much desiderated in that work :—

The Protestant theory teaches that remission of guilt, and restoration to the favour of God, is independent of any sacramental ordinance. . . . The Protestant school is subdivided. One section holds that the repentance of the individual is requisite for obtaining pardon ; and that forgiveness and re-instatement in his former privileges is given in answer to fervent prayer : but that no outward pledge or earnest of reconciliation is accorded. The other section hold that pardon is consequent on a sudden operation of Grace upon the soul.

The first section believes that the only requisite is a feeling of sorrow for sin, coupled with a lively faith in the merits of Christ, and a firm resolution of amendment. 'Justification by faith,' as they understand it, is the result of some religious emotion, nascent virtue, earnest prayer, and a devout perusal of the sacred volume. . . . .

The view of the second section is more startling. Conversion is the work of a moment, and becomes synonymous with Justification. Old things are passed away. The old Adam is sloughed off, and the new man put on with the imputed righteousness of Christ covering all. In an instant the work is complete ; an inward emotion, a flash of interior light, and the soul is purified and united to its Saviour. . . . [This justification] gives assurance of eternal glory. The deathbed of the justified is one of triumph, not of penitence. He goes forth, not as a sinner before his Judge, but as a victor to his crown. Not for one moment does he think upon the past, nor dream of regarding the sins and offences of his youth, and the trespasses of his maturer years. He passes away in a transport of rapture, exulting in the certainty of his election.

We have quoted these paragraphs for more than one reason. In the first place, if the doctrines contained in them be false, as our essayists, with us, hold them to be, then are they not only poisonous, in common with all heretical doctrines, but specially pernicious—and more particularly the second of them—not merely in their direct moral effect on dispositions and acts, but in begetting another deep and dreadful delusion in those who receive them, similar to that which we above adverted to. When we remember the warning of the Apostle, to work out our salvation "with fear and trembling,"\* and

---

\* Philipp. ii. 12.

the example he gives of his own way of working out his salvation—"I chastise my body, and bring it unto subjection: lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway"\*; when we remember the agonizing dread that so often convulsed the hearts even of great saints at the thought of judgment and eternity, we are perfectly astounded in reading and hearing so often about Protestant deathbeds of confidence as unclouded and undoubting, as if it rested on a special revelation, direct, clear, and indisputable. To our minds, and in a Catholic view, there is something absolutely appalling in the mere idea of a fallen son of Adam thus preparing for his immediate, final, everlasting doom; thus girding his exhausted and expiring faculties with the very steel armour of pride itself, to stand in the presence of infinite holiness, and, what is more, of infinite justice too. If we shrink and shudder at the bare thought, how should we feel in contemplating the awful but too real fact?

Now, in the second place, the doctrine, out of which grows this self-confidence and self-approbation, is not only openly professed by hundreds of thousands among the members of the Established Church, by distinguished ministers and teachers of that Church; but has never, as far as we know, received the slightest wound of censure from that Church, or from any authorized tribunal existing in that Church; while, on the other hand, the party to whom our essayists belong are, while these lines are being traced, staggering and reeling under the heavy blow of a judicial sentence, against which they protest in vain, and from which, as long as they retain their present position, they have no appeal. And what a position this is! Sydney Smith's image of round bodies thrust into square holes, and square bodies thrust into round holes, is a picture of absolute comfort and adaptation, compared to a position so incongruous that it almost gives a point even to the stale and stupid blackguardism of *Punch*.

In pages 23-4 the following curious sentence occurs:—"This is the reason why Protestantism, leaning on the Bible, and the Bible only, is so like the house built upon the sand. Every word in the holy text is shifting in its meaning, and every sentence is capable of the most varied interpretations. Whereas, to the Catholic, these particles cohere, forming solid rock, bound into one by the cement of the unaltering witness of traditional interpretation." When these gentlemen talk thus of Catholics—and what they say is perfectly true—whom do they mean by Catholics? Not their own

---

\* 1 Cor. ix. 27.

“Branch,” surely : for they might as well say that a heap of sand is a solid rock as that the doctrines of that Church, or its doctrinal interpretations of Scripture, cohere into one solid whole. They do not mean themselves alone ; and, for reasons already given, if they mean themselves and us conjointly, they mean a chimera, a mere creature of a mystified imagination, and speak like him who “openeth his mouth in vain, and multiplieth words without knowledge.”

In the course of the essay there are several excellent, and, indeed, unanswerable, replies to a number of popular Protestant objections against the Catholic doctrine of confession and priestly absolution. But when our essayists come to show that this doctrine is recognized by the Church of England, and brand the contrary assertion of Mr. Canon Boyd as a piece of amazing audacity (p. 30), they fling themselves on the horns of a dilemma, from which escape is impossible.

We entirely agree in the following statement of Mr. Boyd (p. 32) :—“Judged, not by isolated passages, but by its whole tenor, we are surely justified in affirming that our Liturgy knows nothing of the power of authoritative Absolution.” It is perfectly clear to us that the Protestant interpretation, put by him on the “isolated passages” is, in substance at least, that adopted by every Bishop in the Established Church, by every minister and layman, with the exception of a number so insignificant, that the entire withdrawal of them, in a single day and in one mass, from that communion, would make hardly any, if any, appreciable change in its condition. An event so sudden and startling would, indeed, make a considerable noise : leaders and paragraphs in all the newspapers ; but in a month or two the whole occurrence would be forgotten by the general public.

Let us, however, concede that the Catholic doctrine of confession and absolution is, and for the last three centuries has been, recognized by the Established Church ; and see the fearful condition in which she is thereby placed, during the whole course of these three centuries. She recognizes the doctrine to be divine, and therefore must recognize the use and application of it as salutary. And yet up to the rise of the Tractarian party, less than forty years ago, was there a single parish in all England or Ireland in which the doctrine was reduced to practice ? We believe, not one. Was there a single minister, in either country, who announced to his congregation the duty or the utility, or even the lawfulness, of having recourse to confession and absolution ; or a single member of any congregation who had recourse thereto ? We believe, not one. Is there at the present moment a single

parish, in either country, in which the practice of confession can be truly said to be a prevailing one—prevailing, we mean, among regular church-going and religious-minded people; in whom alone we, of course, should fairly look for it, or expect to find it? We believe, not one. How many parishes are there in which the practice exists at all, even among the select few? Such has been the condition of the Established Church for so many centuries: such is her condition at the present day. Such has been her condition from that very period when she took to herself the new title of “Reformed.” That is to say, before that period she not only *recognized* a doctrine, according to which there has been established by God a most efficacious means at once for the remission of sin, and the prevention of sin; but she *acted* upon the doctrine; and that great means of recovering and preserving the life of grace was, everywhere throughout her fold and every day, resorted to and applied. Since that period she has, indeed, according to our authors, recognized the doctrine; but it has all this time remained a dead letter in the volume of her Liturgy—dead as the mighty men of old, barren as the barren fig-tree, buried deep in earth as the hidden talent. Whisper it in her ear, and it is echoed back in a volley of laughter, or a hiss of scorn: try to realize it before her eyes, and she calls on her wise men and her strong men to take it out of her sight. And this is a reformation—a renewal of strength and beauty! Then was Samson renewed in his strength and beauty when he lay, shorn of his seven locks, blind and bound in chains in the prison of Gaza.

Let us for a moment change pictures, and turn from the Church where the doctrine is recognized but not practised, to the Church where it is both recognized and practised.

One of the popular Protestant objections, above alluded to, against confession is thus put by our essayists (p. 37):—“The confessional has a demoralizing effect on penitent and confessor.” We give their answer for sake of the extract contained in it; which, though doubtless familiar to many of our readers, may be unknown to many more. It is as follows:—

This I emphatically deny. But into this objection I will not enter, as it will probably be considered in another tract. Let me quote, however, the testimony of a Protestant to the benefits of the Confessional in Ireland. Dr. Forbes, in his “Memorandums made in Ireland in the Autumn of 1852,” says, “At any rate the result of my inquiries is, that—whether right or wrong in a theological or rational point of view—this instrument of Confession is, among the Irish of the humbler classes, a direct preservative against certain forms of immorality at least” (vol. ii. p. 81). “Among other

charges preferred against Confession, in Ireland and elsewhere, is the facility it affords for corrupting the female mind, and of its actually leading to such corruption. . . . So far from such corruption resulting from the Confessional, it is the general belief in Ireland—a belief expressed to me by many trustworthy men in all parts of the country, and by Protestants as well as Catholics—that the singular purity of female life among the lower classes there is, in a considerable degree, dependent on this very circumstance” (p. 83). “With a view of testing, as far as was practicable, the truth of the theory respecting the influence of Confession on this branch of morals, I have obtained, through the courtesy of the Poor Law Commissioners, a return of the number of legitimate and illegitimate children in the work-houses of each of the four provinces of Ireland, on a particular day, viz., the 27th November, 1852. It is curious to mark how strikingly the results there conveyed correspond with the Confession theory; the proportion of illegitimate children coinciding almost exactly with the relative proportions of the two religions in each province; *being large where the Protestant element is large, and small where it is small, &c.*” (p. 245).

The powerful and efficacious influence of confession in preventing sin and reclaiming from sin, especially

that sin—

The sin of all most sure to blight,  
The sin of all that the soul's light  
Is soonest lost, extinguished in,

is not merely a theological dogma, or a theological conclusion to be reasoned out. It is a *fact*. Nor is it a fact local, or occasional, or obscure, or discoverable only by a few select witnesses, however respectable and weighty. It is a fact, plain, tangible, world-wide, and ages-long; existing wherever a Catholic congregation exists on the face of the earth; everywhere witnessed, through every day that dawns and declines, through every generation that comes and goes, by every priest who sits in the tribunal of confession, by every penitent who kneels there; witnessed by millions on millions of every clime, of every race, of every profession, of every state and condition and line of life, from the king on his throne to the beggar in the street, from the polished courtier to the reclaimed savage, from the learned theologian and philosopher to the unlettered clown; witnessed by married and unmarried, by rich and poor; by the father and mother of many children; by their daughter, a girl at school; by their daughter, about to become a bride; by their daughter, a cloistered nun; by their son, a Zouave in the army; by their son, a student at college; by their son, practising at the bar; by their son, a judge on the bench; by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; by the convict under sentence of death; by the soldier, on the eve of battle;

by the evicted peasant, about to leave the land of his fathers for ever; by the youth who has preserved his baptismal innocence; by the youth who has sadly lost it; by the matured man, after years of dissipation; by the hoary sinner, on his dying bed. Of the millions who, in every quarter of the Catholic world, are every day of every year crowding round the confessional, is there one who, going there with a sincere heart and upright intention, does not feel on leaving it that he has received a new principle of life, a new strength to fight the good fight, a new love of holiness, an odour of paradise scenting his soul, his youth renewed like the eagle's? He may fall again, as many do—that is poor human nature; but well he knows, as all who have tried know well, that his only hope of rising again is in returning again to drink of the invigorating waters of that sacred fountain. Is there any other fact, has there ever been any other fact, on the face of God's earth, attested by such a body of such witnesses, primary witnesses, who themselves have felt, and seen, and known, stretching out from land to land, from generation to generation? Yet there ever has been, as there ever will be, that infinite number of fools, of whom the wise man speaks, and who have ears and hear not, who have eyes and see not.

Where these things are is surely the city on the mountain, the city of God. Here surely is fulfilled, though it is but part of the fulfilment of, the prophecy of old:—"O poor little one, tossed with tempest, without all comfort, behold I will lay thy stones in order, and will lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy bulwarks of jasper, and thy gates of graven stones, and all thy borders of desirable stones. All thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children." Ay, and the children of that Church who frequent this holy institution, this the great means of sanctification entrusted to her, feel that very peace, that peace of God which surpasseth all understanding, that peace which the world can neither give nor take away, and feel it in the deepest depths of the soul. Ask them, you who are not of them, and with one voice they will tell you it is so. Then, "Why stand you here all the day idle? Go you also into My vineyard."

---

For ourselves, no need to express our pain, in seeing so many tender loving hearts still left in the wild, outside the pale of that vineyard which is the chosen care of the Almighty and all merciful Lord; while there needs only a single step to place them within it—a pain multiplied a thousand fold to



those who have among them friends, dear as their own souls by the ties of nature and by innumerable memories of days, when both were as yet walking, side by side, in that path which by His infinite mercy has led themselves within its gate. How and why these things are, will in many respects never be explained to us, so long as we remain in that land in which we see only through a glass dimly. But as long as we can believe that men are really in good faith (and this, without presuming to judge of individuals one way or the other, we do believe of the school, at large), so long we may retain our conviction, that as a school, even their unconscious errors are being used by our all-merciful Father, for the good of our beloved country. On more than one previous occasion, we have followed out this line of thought; and our readers will quite understand that we should greatly regret any event which made the existence of the Ritualist school in the national establishment an impossibility, or which made it impossible that any man in good faith should continue to belong to it. For a moment many persons, among whom we were not numbered, thought that this would be the effect of the late judgment of the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. The most fair and religiously conducted of Protestant newspapers, the representative of the more religious section of what is called the Broad party—the *Spectator*—wrote, the day after the judgment,—

“Taken in connection with the decisions of the same Court on questions of doctrine, its tendency will be this—to cut off all those escape-valves for the transubstantionist vein of thought in the Church, which (what we should call) superstitious gestures, rites, and attitudes, have hitherto afforded. The celebrant of the Eucharist in the English Church is now forbidden to mark by any outward sign any strong divergence of belief on this head, from the ordinary Protestant belief of which he may be conscious. We think it evident, that the effect will be to shut the safety-valve by which our Romanising priests, in the usual spirit of English compromise, have hitherto got rid of their own self-dissatisfaction at being associated with such an ancient set of heretics. Now that, if they obey the laws, they will be obliged to become undistinguishable from the crowd of mere Protestants; will they be able to bear their situation? The most earnest and heartily convinced among them, we imagine, can scarcely be content to acquiesce in the impoverished worship to which they are now consigned. We suspect the judgment will drive a good many, and a good many of the best among the ritualist priests, into another communion.”

To a certain extent the writer regretted this. He regretted that “in great towns where churches of all sorts are open to believers of all sorts; men who have hitherto sincerely believed themselves Anglicans should no longer be able to

gratify their religious tastes and devotional feelings as they like best," especially if it drives them to Rome.

The writer here took it for granted ; first, that the judgment would make "ritualist" worship impossible in the Church of England ; next, that the annoyance caused by this would drive the best of the Ritualist clergy to the Catholic Church. Now to take the last point first ; we very greatly doubt whether among the many hundreds of educated men and women converted in the last five and twenty years, any one has been decided by considerations such as this. It is necessary to insist on this point, because Anglicans, we may say universally, take it for granted that people become "Romanists" either because they are "attracted by gorgeous ceremonial ;" or because they are impatient of unkind, unjust, unsympathizing treatment from Anglican Bishops, or for some cause equally childish.\* We must deliberately declare, therefore, after a very large acquaintance with converts of all classes, that we have never known one of either sex, who became a Catholic, except from the conviction, that God had made the Catholic Church the one appointed means of salvation ; and had caused him to know, that the Church of which Pius IX. is now the Head on earth, is the one Catholic Church.† It is amazing that Protestants should shut their eyes to this notorious fact ; first, because the sufferings of converts from the loss not merely of worldly possessions, comforts, and position, but of friends and family, and of the associations and sweet recollections of their whole lives, are so great, that no man in his senses would think it worth while to undergo them for any lesser reason ; and next, because they generally admit converts to be conscientious men ; and yet it is plain, that to change their religion on the grounds which their friends unhesitatingly assign for their conversion,

---

\* We see, with real surprise, that John Keble, one of the most tender and sympathizing as well as most humble of men, speaking of one who resembled himself very minutely in those points of character, although evidently unlike him in many others—Robert Isaac Wilberforce—mentions more than once most prominently among the qualities which would keep him in the Anglican Church, his "good humour," and even puts that word in *Italics*. Of course this takes for granted that his temptation, as Keble deemed it, would be impatience. No amount of "good humour" could avail to prevent any man from coming to the conclusion, that it was essential to his own salvation to join the Church of which Pius IX. is the head on earth. We should have thought Keble must have known his friend well enough to be aware that he was one of the last men living who would ever have thought of leaving the Church of England on any other ground than that.

† Mr. Ffoulkes indeed now believes that he was himself an exception ; but we much doubt whether at the time of his conversion he would have said anything different from the rest.

and indeed on any less ground than the one we have assigned, would be a reckless violation of clear duty ; an unquestionable sin. We do not deny that, in this and that instance, small circumstances may have been among the blessed instruments of God's Grace in aiding to produce that conviction ; but it was the conviction itself, not those circumstances, which was the cause of the man's conversion. So in the present instance, it is quite possible and much to be hoped that the interference of the Court of Appeal with ritualist worship may lead one and another person seriously to consider the proofs, that what is called the Roman, is really the only Catholic Church, and the answers by which Anglicans have endeavoured to meet those proofs ; and that such consideration may bring them into it. This is right and reasonable. God grant it may be very widely the case. But we cannot imagine that any clergyman can be so light and reckless, as to allow the "annoyance" to lead him to take so solemn a step. Of course also any honest man whom such a trifle may have helped in coming to his resolution would still act upon it, without hesitation, even if, before he did so, the highest possible ritual could be restored with the full consent of all parties.

But farther ; it is already pretty plain that Lord Cairns's judgment will not render Ritualist worship impossible. Let us observe its history. The Mackonochie case came last year before the Court of Arches. This Court represents the ancient Ecclesiastical Court of the Province of Canterbury, and the judge still sits in the name and by the appointment of the Protestant Archbishop, although, since the Reformation, he is not an ecclesiastic, but a mere secular lawyer. The present Dean of the Arches, Sir R. Phillimore, however, has paid much attention to ecclesiastical law. On March 28th he decided that the mixture of water with the wine, and the use of incense in the Protestant communion service, and the elevation of the bread and wine after the supposed consecration, were forbidden by the existing law of the Church of England. Mr. Mackonochie's practice of kneeling just before the elevation, he said, was a point on which the bishop's advice should be taken, and not a subject for prosecution. The lighting of two candles on the communion-table, in token that Christ is the light of the world, he decided to be required by law. In this decision it was at first announced that both parties would acquiesce. On consideration, however, Mr. Mackonochie's accusers appealed to the Privy Council. There, sentence was given against him on all the questions raised, and costs both in the Court of Arches and in the Appeal were given against him.

Ever since this sentence was given, on Dec. 23, there has been great discussion among the Ritualists, both lay and clerical, whether it ought to be obeyed. Notwithstanding these differences of opinion, we believe that all parties have practically resolved to obey it on all points. Some have declared that they will wait, until they receive orders to that effect from their bishops. This comes to the same thing. There may, of course, be out-of-the-way country parishes, in which the combined influence of the rector and the squire may prevent any complaints, and where, therefore, the rites in question may go on, without being brought before the notice of the bishop. In such a case he will, no doubt, be glad to shut or, at least, to turn away his eyes. But if his action is required at all, a Protestant bishop must, of course, order obedience to the law, whatever it is. The rites in dispute, therefore, are practically put a stop to.

But this does not imply the prohibition of "Ritualistic" worship. New observances may be adopted which, however unauthorized, can be stopped only by a new suit, in which it is far from certain that the same spirit would prevail in the Court of Privy Council. For instance, it has been proposed that tall candles should be placed, not on but close to the communion-table, on each side, and that boys bearing lighted torches should kneel in the chancel. One ingenious man suggests, that as the candles are not forbidden when needed for light, the chancel windows should be covered with outside shutters during the communion service, in which case, he concludes, the candles may legally be lighted. Mr. Mackonochie has already hung up seven huge lamps, which are to burn before the communion-table day and night. He has explained that this is not intended as an evasion of the sentence. Another very amusing but quite serious proposal has been made. The old law of the Protestant establishment was very strict in forbidding any clergyman to preach anywhere, or under any pretence, without reading the church prayers, as a sort of preface to his sermon. This was a great annoyance to the Puritan school, and a most effectual instrument against them in the hands of Laud and others; for they hated the prayer-book, and wanted to have the liberty of preaching whenever they pleased, which was then allowed to no one in England, but has long been freely conceded to the dissenters. To meet this wish, Lord Shaftesbury (who sympathises with that school) has obtained a bill, by which a clergyman is allowed to have whatever service he likes, so that it is not in the church, in which "dearly beloved" and "the wicked man" retain their monopoly. In virtue of this act there is, we believe, not one

clergyman in England, of the Low Church school, who does not, at some time of the week, most frequently on Thursday evening, shut up his church and have preaching, preceded by an extempore (so-called) prayer, in his school-room or elsewhere. It has been suggested, therefore, that in virtue of this act a clergyman may, if he pleases, imitate exactly the Roman Mass, whether High or Low, without troubling himself at all with the Church Prayer-book, or Lord Cairns's judgment: so that he does it elsewhere than in the parish church. That one, who is after all nothing more than a layman and a Protestant, should thus travestie those awful mysteries, is no doubt shocking to our Catholic instincts and conscience. But we do not see what legal difficulty would interfere. There is something really amusing in the idea that Lord Shaftesbury, whose almost insane thirst for persecuting the Ritualists leads him, year by year, to introduce bills, no one of which the more sober Protestants in Parliament have, as yet, been persuaded to pass, may turn out to have himself introduced and pressed through Parliament an act, for giving them complete liberty in all places outside the parish church! This plan has at least the advantage that it could not interfere with any Low-Churchman, as he may continue to hear "dearly beloved" in the parish church, and is not obliged to go to any new building which Mr. Mackonochie or others may open for their own purposes.

It should be observed that the practices of the Puritan party, though more decorous than formerly, are still made as unlike worship as can be managed; and therefore, although the Ritualists are compelled to put out their candles, and forbidden to bring in incense, it is certain that even without those adjuncts, one of them robed in vestments exactly like those of a Catholic priest, standing day by day at the altar with his back to the congregation, and taking care that the words he says should not be heard (so that no one can tell whether he is speaking English or Latin), imitating as closely as possible the rites of the Mass, and afterwards speaking of what he has been doing by that name—will be in sufficiently marked contrast to the Puritan, who once a month goes to the north end of the communion table, and there, turning himself as much as he can towards the people, "impressively" preaches to them the communion service.

We are convinced, therefore, that things will go on much as they have; and we hope as well as believe that the number of churches in which the Catholic service is imitated, will continue to increase. It is to be remembered that there are comparatively few in which lights and incense have, in times

past, been introduced. Where they have never been used, things will at least continue as they have been. And meanwhile it should not be forgotten that the Ritualists have gained as well as lost by the late judgment.

The judges of the Court of Appeal laid it down in the strongest terms, that they had no power to allow any deviation from the letter of the Rubric, either in excess or defect. Now the Rubric requires a "Bishop" to appear at the communion service with a "rochet, chasuble, alb, and pastoral staff;" and the "Priest" to wear a chasuble, and we really hardly know what not. Copes, too, are ordered for both. There was at first very serious thought, on the part of the Ritualists, of prosecuting Dr. Tait himself for not obeying this law, and many threats were uttered against the leaders of the Puritan party—self-styled "Evangelicals." This notion has been given up—wisely, we are sure. Plain as the words of the Rubric seem, the Committee of Council would have strained the law almost to any extent, rather than have enforced a practice so very long disused, and which would have caused such intense disgust. We can hardly doubt that it would immediately have led to an act of Parliament to alter the law. Besides, what would have been gained, except the annoyance of their opponents, by forcing men who, by their preaching and their whole conduct, repudiate and denounce the very idea of the Christian sacrifice, to wear, against their will, the sacrificial vestments? The Ritualists, therefore, have done wisely, in making no attempt to force upon their opponents the observance of the letter of the law. Still, it is a great advantage to themselves to be able to say, that while they themselves keep to the law, as declared by the Supreme Court (although convinced that the judgment is erroneous), their opponents systematically disregard, what is, beyond all question, the law.

It is really amusing that Lord Cairns, no doubt quite unconsciously and unintentionally, has given them, by the late judgment, a new triumph of this sort. He had, we strongly suspect, no notion what an Anglican clergyman ordinarily does, or how he is placed, during the communion service. Mr. Mackonochie was accused of kneeling during "the prayer of consecration;" kneeling, he knew, is, generally speaking, an expression of reverence. The Ritualists, he knew, were wont to indulge in unusual outward signs of reverence. He wanted, therefore, to forbid kneeling if he decently could. With this view he looked at the Rubric and saw, we suspect with great pleasure, that nothing could be easier. It described the "Priest" as



“standing before the table” just before that prayer; and it was evident that he must then be turning towards it, because he is to arrange the bread and wine upon it. After this, nothing was said in the Rubric as to any change of posture. Lord Cairns, therefore, decided that all through that prayer, from beginning to end, “the Priest” is to stand in front of the altar, turning towards it. We doubt not he was quite unconscious that he was deciding in favour of the Ritualists, the one point which has always excited the extremest horror and disgust of the Puritans. We have known a Puritan curate utter a protest, by groaning deeply and loudly, as soon as he saw his rector begin the “Prayer of Consecration” standing in that position. He knew, what we strongly suspect Lord Cairns did not know, that the Catholic Priest always stands exactly in the same position in front of the altar and turning towards it, when offering the sacrifice of the Mass. The Ritualists therefore will stand through the “prayer of consecration” with their backs to the people, and are already consoling themselves for being forbidden to kneel just after the words of “consecration,” by the discovery that there is no direction of the kind in the old Sarum Missal. Probably it was done by tradition; for the Rubrics of the Sarum Missal were, we believe, in general much less full than those of the Roman. We have no idea that the effect of this ruling will be to compel any Puritan Bishop or clergyman to stand in front of the Table. But there are, we doubt not, very many who have long been wishing, but half afraid, to introduce such a change. To them it will be everything to be able to say to their churchwardens, &c., “Surely you would not have me break the law, which has just been so clearly laid down by her Majesty herself, on the advice of the judges.” There are few churchwardens with whom such an authority will not weigh much more than a whole catena of general councils. We believe, therefore, that the effect of the judgment will be to make what may be called semi-Ritualism much more general; and we cannot help feeling, with a writer in the *Tablet*, that we should like to have been present, invisible, next time Dr. Tait and Lord Cairns had a private conference. The learned judge, who expected, no doubt, to be heartily thanked for a great party service, was, we much suspect, let (all too late) into the secret, that he had done very nearly, if not quite, as much for the Ritualists as against them. The judgment will, no doubt, act, as it was chiefly intended to act, as a slap in the face to Mr. Mackonochie, and a good many other extreme men. But not to say that

they can in one way or other evade it, as we have seen, and are not at all loath to do so; they have always the resource, of which they have often before availed themselves, of calling it a persecution.

And for this complaint there would seem to be considerable foundation. That the doctrine and discipline of the Anglican communion should be settled by the State, is no reasonable ground of complaint, because that is its fundamental principle. But it has a right to demand that the State law should be fairly and justly administered. And we think few, after reading Mr. Chambers's strictures, will doubt that he establishes what he asserts; that the judgment in Mr. Mackonochie's case was not a judicial act, of men honestly setting themselves to define and explain the law as it is (as English judges do in any question of property, rights, or franchise, and would feel themselves dishonoured if they should fail to do so), but that it was a mere party measure, in his own words, "A foredoomed and preconcerted catastrophe, prearranged to satisfy the exigencies and gratify the spleen of one particular section in the Church, and to spite and overawe the other;" or, as he says again, "not a well-weighed, deliberate, and impartial declaration of legal truth emanating from even-handed justice, but an astute, deceptive, hasty, and vehement argument, framed on the spur of the occasion by a clever and overbearing advocate to support a foregone conclusion." We have no doubt that this was really the fact.

One fact which he states is most important in its bearing, not only on this particular case, or on the Church of England, but upon the administration of justice as a whole. It is asserted by Mr. Chambers that the Lord Chancellor nominates out of the Privy Council the particular judges by whom each appeal shall be heard—that this is usually done by a rotation; but that, in the present instance, Lord Cairns departed from that rotation, and selected such judges—

That the tribunal which actually sat to adjudicate was composed, with two or three exceptions, of persons not versed except as partizans in the question in dispute, and of one particular complexion of opinion on Church questions. The appeal was heard, judgment was nominally reserved; but although the careful and laborious judges in the Westerton case were occupied for many months before they made up their minds on the few points submitted to them, these offhand justiciaries delivered their sentence within as many weeks, notwithstanding that the several questions which they had to decide necessitated quite as deep, long-continued, and impartial research into ecclesiastical history, liturgical treatises, and legal documents (p. 3).

In the course of his pamphlet Mr. Chambers, as we have seen, contends, and we think establishes, that the sentence

was one-sided and erroneous, and one which would not have been delivered by any man learned upon the subject and fairly judging it. In this passage he states more than enough to account for such a judgment; viz., that the judgment itself was hasty; and that those by whom it was delivered were chosen from the list of Privy Councillors, not fairly and impartially, but by setting aside the ordinary rotation, and selecting men known to have previously committed themselves upon the questions to be decided, and (it is naturally presumed) because they were so known.

This is in itself a very grave charge against Lord Cairns, against whom Mr. Chambers makes it. Some persons may perhaps be disposed to defend him, at the expense of those by whom he was placed at the head of the English law. It was hardly to be expected, they will say, that a leader of the Irish Orange party would either have more than a shallow partizan knowledge on Church questions, or be able to act impartially in a case which so immediately appealed to the passions of that party. For the charge was, that a clergyman of the Protestant Church was secretly infecting it with "Popery." All that they will admit, therefore, is that it was unfortunate for Mr. Mackonochie that his case should have happened to come on for hearing at the moment when Lord Cairns was Chancellor.

Unfortunately, however, Mr. Chambers also states that the case, as a matter of fact, did not come on for hearing in its turn. If it had, he says, it could not have been taken till late in 1869. Now, after the general election, if not sooner, it became clear that neither Mr. Disraeli nor his Lord Chancellor would remain in office later than December, 1868. Either, therefore, the case must be taken out of its turn, or else the appointment of the judges to hear it would not rest with Lord Cairns, but with his successor. That successor, whether he were Sir Roundell Palmer, Sir John Duke Coleridge, or Sir William Page Wood, would notoriously not have selected to decide it the persons chosen by Lord Cairns.

In this state of things the appeal in the *S. Alban's* case was advanced out of its turn, from the bottom of a long list to the head of the same; and although, in the ordinary course, it could not have been taken till late in 1869, it was forced on to a hearing first. This must have been by order of the Lord Chancellor himself, who has, I am credibly informed, the disposition of such matters; he also, it seems, nominates the Privy Councillors who are to determine these specialities (p. 3).

We have here several very grave statements, which hang together very unpleasantly. 1. That the sentence itself was

hasty, partial, and one-sided. 2. That the judges who delivered it were not taken by rotation, as usual, but that men known to have strong opinions on the subject were selected, for no apparent reason except that they did hold them. 3. That this selection could not have been made unless the cause had been taken for hearing, immediately before Lord Cairns went out of office; and, 4. That it was taken for hearing nearly a year before it would have come on in its course, for no apparent reason except that the judges by whom it was to be decided might be appointed by him while he was still in office.

We know nothing of these facts. But we must say that either Mr. Chambers, himself a judge, makes very unfounded statements, or else that Lord Cairns has some very ill-looking facts to explain. The matter we repeat touches not only Mr. Mackonochie, or the Established Church, but the whole administration of justice in England.

The Church of England, as such, may of course reasonably complain, if (as would seem to have been the case in this instance) the law of the State is unfairly administered with regard to it. But its members weaken their own cause, when they complain, as they often do, that its doctrine and discipline should be determined by a merely temporal court. For this is the exact meaning of the "Royal Supremacy," to which it is not merely committed, but which is its life, its essence, its cause of existence. We have no room to prove this at the end of a long article, nor is there need, as all men are agreed upon it, except a handful of "unionists," resolved not to recognize notorious facts. It is, therefore, an inconsistency not less than ludicrous, that the Ritualists should be talking, as they now are, of submitting to the temporal rulers, merely as an act of civil and political obedience. The fundamental principle of their communion is that expressed at first in the words, "His Majesty is a Spiritual Person," and we express the same thing now by saying, that the laity represented by Parliament, not the hierarchy or the clergy, have the right to all authority, both legislative and judicial, in the Church of England. Lord Cairns and others, no doubt, are now abusing the principle of the English Reformation. What we now see was not intended when the supremacy was, with much reluctance and hesitation, submitted to by those bishops and priests, who (shrinking from the fiery trial by which Fisher and More obtained their crowns), "conformed to the times," as it used to be said in those days. They no doubt hoped and expected that the settlement of spiritual matters would always be trusted by the king to

the spirituality of England, not left at the mercy of a secular Parliament. To say all this is only to give one more example of the notorious truth, that when men begin to swerve from principle and duty, they little think how deep is the abyss into which they are plunging themselves and their children. Those wretched men too well knew, that, to save their own lives and fortunes, they were allowing England to be separated from the one Catholic Church. They hoped and believed, indeed, that the separation would be only for a moment, that the tyranny would soon pass over; that without sacrificing themselves, they might still leave to those who should come after them the inheritance of the Faith. But none the less did they give way to, if they did not originate, the cry, "We have no king but Cæsar; we will not have this Man to reign over us." And eminently on them and theirs has been fulfilled the warning given by the Prophet of old to the Israelites, who obstinately declared, "Nay, but a king shall reign over us," whereas the Lord their God was their king. "This," he said, "will be the right of the king that shall reign over you," and after enumerating in detail his galling tyranny over them and their children, he summed up,—“You shall cry out in that day from the face of the king, whom you have chosen to yourselves, and the Lord will not hear you in that day, because you desired unto yourself a king.” What else is the true meaning of the complaints which we now hear all around us—that the Church of England is ruled, not (as was promised) by the spirituality of England; not by a religious sovereign in person, but by a parliament in which Dissenters, Jews, and infidels, freely occupy seats—that its highest court of appeal upon essential matters of doctrine and discipline derives its colour from a successful barrister, an Irish Orangeman (of whom it appears that it is not exact to call him a Presbyterian, only because, in fact, he belongs to no church or sect in particular)—what is all this but the helpless wail under the oppression of an earthly tyrant, raised by those who chose from themselves and their children the royal supremacy, when they had already “the Lord their God for their king,” when the Incarnate Son crucified, risen, and ascended, was actually ruling over them in His Church, by the hands and in the person of His Vicar?

As to individuals, thank God, it is as yet not too late to escape the most bitter part of the sentence, “Ye shall cry out in that day from the face of the king whom you have chosen to yourselves, and the Lord will not hear you.” For they are still invited to take refuge, one by one, under that theocracy which their fathers deserted, that kingdom of Heaven in

which Christ our Lord still rules in the person of Pius. But for our country we can only plead in trembling prayer, "They knew not what they did," and implore that it may not yet be too late for her restoration, as a nation, to the place in that kingdom which she has abandoned.

As for that which still presumes to call itself "the Church of England" (a title to which it forfeited all claim on the day on which it abandoned its only Lord and took in His stead a mortal master and protector), the fate which it is even now awaiting, with fear and trembling, at the hands of the secular authority, is but too truly figured, by that which falls upon a woman who forgets her honour, no less than her duty, and degrades herself to be the paramour of some great man. For a while, flattered and made much of, her moral degradation is the poison which soon destroys the very qualities he once admired and coveted; and if she stays long enough under his roof, she is likely not only to be neglected, but stripped of the very jewels and gawds which rewarded her servitude, and turned away, hated and dishonoured, from his door. Before the schism, the English Church was indeed the glory of all lands; her Primate "*alterius orbis Papa*," her Prelates renowned throughout Christendom for learning, munificence, and sanctity, no less than for wealth and dignities; her religious houses—what they then were, we may still in some degree guess, from the miserable fragments of a few which still remain—of her monks and nuns we may say, in the language of Scripture, "Her Nazarites were whiter than snow!" And where is it all now? On the day in which those who sat in the seats of her rulers and her people, submitted (however reluctantly) to the Royal Supremacy, she became the slave of secular princes and the minister of their lawless passions, and under their protection she has remained, now boasting herself in the rewards of her degradation, now cowering and crying out that she was "in danger." Long ago she has lost, not only "the glory of the king's daughter, which was from within" (that was gone from the first), but even her power and favour with the people; and the only question that now remains is, how soon the temporal rulers will drive her out, dishonoured and stripped of her jewels, from the doors to which she is still convulsively clinging, and hopelessly crying out for their protection and support.



## ART. VIII.—MR. GLADSTONE'S IRISH POLICY.

*A Bill to put an end to the Establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make Provision in respect of the Temporalities thereof, and in respect of the Royal College of Maynooth. (Prepared and brought in by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.) Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed. 1 March, 1869.*

WITH the death of Lord Palmerston, there came to an end a sort of truce in public policy and even party warfare, which had been by no means what was called in the Middle Ages, the truce of God. Lord Palmerston's one object had been to hold office as long as possible, and on as easy terms ; and in order to do so, he was willing on many subjects to practise the policy of the Opposition to the extent of almost alienating the most earnest and thoughtful of his supporters. His policy towards Ireland in particular, was a Tory policy far more offensive than Lord Derby or Mr. Disraeli would have ventured to avow. No Conservative premier would of late years have permitted himself to use such a phrase as that "tenant right is landlord wrong;" no Tory secretary has treated the dignitaries of the Catholic Church in Ireland after the insolent fashion of Sir Robert Peel. But Lord Palmerston felt that any Irish policy was good enough for the ineffable servility of the great mass of the Irish members who supported him ; and who accordingly went on voting with him and cheering him, while he told the House that he was determined to defend the Established Church to the death ; that the land tenure of Ireland was all that it ought to be ; that it was a very good thing for Irishmen to go to America, so that cattle and sheep should take their place ; and that the country was perfectly loyal and would be perfectly contented, if it was only let alone—until one day it came to pass that he died. Then followed a change most complete. Then after a period of what Mr. Disraeli calls "violent tranquillity," came one of strange upheaval and sudden downfall. Mr. Bright had spoken of the residuum of our constituencies in one session, to be taught in the next that Household Suffrage was in truth an eminently conservative institution ; and to find, after the first General Election under Household Suffrage, that the Ballot was

absolutely within reach. The new forces let loose on Lord Palmerston's death, acting apparently with a curious sort of centrifugal energy, soon propelled into the outer spaces of public life the statesmen who had the nearest claims to be considered his contemporaries, though he, indeed, was of a generation previous to them all, having been at the War Office when Sir Arthur Wellesley went to the Peninsula, and countersigned the warrant which sent the Emperor Napoleon to St. Helena. Lord Russell rapidly decayed into a third-rate party pamphleteer. Lord Derby, gracefully draping his dressing-gown round him, availed himself of the excuse of gout to abandon the Premiership to Mr. Disraeli, then in the peculiar position of being much more distrusted by his friends than his enemies, and afterwards the leadership of the Tory aristocracy was entrusted to a Belfast barrister, who barely two years before had been happy to hold briefs for a due consideration in Lincoln's Inn. All venerableness in statesmanship appeared to have acquired, through Lord Palmerston, a certain unreal and ungodly character. The ages of an English Cabinet, especially of a Whig Cabinet, fifteen or twenty years ago, would have easily totted together to the grand climacteric of Methusaleh. But when the only English Premier, who had ever attained the age of eighty in office, died, then came an age of almost juvenile Cabinet Ministers: Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen, Lord Cranborne and Lord Carnarvon, were well under forty years of age when they entered the Cabinet; and Mr. Childers, Mr. Fortescue, Lord Mayo, Mr. Ward Hunt, had, by a few years only, passed that, in an official sense, early age. Mr. Bright, despite his white hair, is always young; and in his single person best represents this great administrative revolution, which is marked not merely by the inferior age of the new Ministers, but by the fact that so large a proportion of them have vaulted into the Cabinet without any previous departmental graduation. Mr. Bright in his day has had, is having, and is likely to have, an influence on England, not less powerful, to say the least of it, than Lord Palmerston. But how their careers contrast! To the one, power has come unsought, almost unwelcome, as an emblem and a pledge of the triumph of his ideas of public policy. To the other, it came as the reward of patience and diligence, used in the service of an ambition, which never had a higher or more humane public object than what he would have called "the honour of England."

But to Ireland the change that has come over the spirit of the State is infinitely more important than it is to any

other part of the empire. There, after the disgraceful failure of the attempt to form an Independent Parliamentary Party in 1852, a period of hopeless and sullen stagnation had set in. Faith in the honour and probity of public men was almost extinguished. In a country like Ireland, where there are great public wrongs unredressed, people either agitate or conspire. When the Irish people saw Mr. Keogh at the Castle, and Mr. Sadleir at the Treasury, Mr. Gavan Duffy leaving the country, and Mr. Lucas leaving the world, they concluded that agitation was rather worse than waste of time. Gradually they took to conspiracy, so far as the more active and buoyant of the population were concerned; and sympathy with conspiracy was, and, it is to be feared, still is, a common sentiment in the mass of the people. It was at this very period that Lord Palmerston, Lord Carlisle, and Sir Robert Peel, for their part, believed that Ireland was at last settling down into a great depôt of live stock, equally ready to supply British markets with mutton, and colonies with men. But suddenly there came a terrible revelation of the inefficiency of the Government and the rottenness of the whole system of the country. Lord Wodehouse awoke one day to the fact, of which only the Castle had been ignorant for some time, that Ireland was honey-combed with the Fenian conspiracy. The "peaceful mother of lowing herds and bleating sheep" was found (if we may be permitted to mix Lord Carlisle's elegant metaphor) to be a sort of Trojan horse, full charged with treason, stratagem, and spoil. A conspiracy containing in its ranks many brave and experienced soldiers, having the disposal of large funds, organized with consummate skill and secrecy, and which was even informally recognized by the Government of the United States, where it maintained its principal base of operations, was found to be the net result of a period of ten years of hollow and corrupt peace in Irish politics. The rules of morality having been conveniently set aside in the public life of the country, the pestilent system of the Continental revolution found an easy lodgment in its entrails. Fenianism has borrowed from Italy, from France, from America, certain characteristic features of secret organization; and it has been able withal so to present itself before the world on various striking occasions, as if it had, in a degree which Continental revolutionary movements have never professed to possess, the sympathy of strong sections of the Catholic clergy. This sympathy has certainly only been a kind of posthumous sympathy, limited to such objects as the saying of Masses for the repose of the souls of executed Fenians, or the collection of funds for the relief of the families

of incarcerated Fenians. Still, it marks a difference at which we can now only glance, but which it would be idle to ignore, between the Fenian Society and Italian Carbonarism, or the French Marianne, or the American Know-Nothing, or Ku-Klux-Klan Societies. It became possible to found the society in consequence of the disorganized and demoralized state of Irish Catholic politics; and these same conditions have rendered it difficult for the ecclesiastical authorities of the country to deal with it frankly and effectively. There is a great difference in this regard between 1848 and 1868. Where "Meagher of the Sword" would have been hunted like a mad dog, Meany with the ticket-of-leave is hailed as a martyr and a confessor. Every one who seriously interrogates himself knows that there is a vast difference between Mr. Meagher and Mr. Meany. But in Ireland, for some time past, people have chosen to live in a state of make-believe and mutual delusion; and the whole country has been subsiding into a condition in which it is difficult to know whether people are (according to Mr. Grattan's lamentably suggestive phrase) "bad subjects or worse rebels."

Such is the grievous and unsettled state of the public mind in the country in which Mr. Gladstone has determined to try the effect of a great act of justice. When he first proposed, a year ago, with his own party in a divided and insubordinate condition, and while a new prestige was gradually gathering round the conduct of the Conservative party, to achieve the abolition of the Irish Established Church as a State Church, we feared that the forces at his command were not equal to the magnitude of the enterprise. Never was there a more conspicuous instance of the power of a great cause in the hands of a great man than the effect of those memorable words, "That Church as a State Church must cease to exist," on Parliament and on the country; and never, we believe, in the annals of English statesmanship, has a question so surrounded with deep and complicated difficulties been so swiftly, so steadily, so thoroughly urged forward towards its final solution. In comparison with the progress of other great questions in Parliament, Catholic Emancipation for example, this one has moved with the easy, irresistible speed of a railway express. What seemed at the moment a gallant but rash sortie proved to be the first blow in a political campaign, every move in which had been carefully calculated and was marked by consummate generalship. So from the verdict of the old Parliament to the verdict of the country in the election of the new Parliament, from the majority of 60 on the resolutions of last year to the majority of 118 on the Bill of this year, the impetus with which the measure was first launched

has been steadily sustained and increased, and yet always kept completely within control. Every day has been marked by progress, and yet the progress has never been in advance of what the day ought to show. The veto of the Lords exhausted last year, the majority in the Commons almost doubled by the general election, the second reading carried at Easter, and the Committee certain to have concluded its work early in May, the position of the Prime Minister is, at this moment, a very commanding one. It had so happened that when he met Parliament, though the general scope of his measure was known beforehand, its method was a profound mystery to all but his Cabinet. There has seldom been a keener curiosity felt as to the details of a great measure than was felt as to the way, for instance, in which the Irish Protestants should be called on to reorganize themselves, the way in which their funds should be placed at their disposal, and, above all, the way in which the surplus of Church property remaining after satisfaction of vested interests should be bestowed. Seldom, if ever, has an English statesman exhibited before Parliament a scheme so well conceived, and so complete in all its parts,—a scheme whose outline is so marked by constructive genius, and whose details are so tempered by considerate justice.

The debate on the second reading of the bill had, as Mr. Miall said, a very unreal character, and this unreality was generally attributed to the sense that a disastrous division was clearly anticipated by the Conservatives. But its accurate forecast of a particular division rarely lessens the ardour of a great party which has faith in its principles. The reason why the debate was unreal seemed rather to be that it was so difficult to get any solid ground on which to assail the measure; and, accordingly, every speaker who opposed the bill opposed it on grounds different from and generally irreconcilable with those of previous speakers on the same side. Mr. Disraeli's despair of finding any point at which a breach in the bill might be made practicable, was strangely illustrated by the taunts which he flung towards the close of his speech at the Irish Tory landlords, many of whom sat behind him—on account of the liberality with which they had been dealt with in the matter of tithe rent-charge—and by his wild prediction that in consequence they would be found joining with their tenants and with the clergy of the Protestant, Presbyterian, and Catholic Churches in demanding some violent agrarian revolution. What, he exclaimed,—

What do I see in this scheme? Why, that the whole of the property of the Church in Ireland, generally speaking, will go to the landlords. Now,

the landlords have had a slice of that property before. For thirty years they have had £100,000 a year. They have probably had £3,000,000 of that property, and what good has it done them? Is the state of Ireland more serene or more tranquil, or have they preserved the institutions to which they were devoted because they had for one moment accepted a share of the plunder of that Church? Why, we all know that nothing of the kind has occurred. And what is now proposed? Why the scheme, when we come to investigate it carefully, shows, I think, that the whole of the rent-charge is to be absorbed in the land. The right hon. gentleman says that every landlord is to buy the rent-charge at a certain rate, and that it must be instantly absorbed in the land. But if he does not buy it he will make a compulsory account, and there is to be a complicated system of pecuniary transactions which are to extend over forty-five years. There are thus to be five-and-forty years of engagements with Irish landlords, in a land which confiscates churches, and where there is a land question looming in the future. Do you not think that the landlords will want justice done to the land? Do you not think they will come forward and say, "Well, if the land question is to be settled, we will take part in the settlement"? Depend upon it when the great rising takes place, when the great demand is made to which I have referred as expounded by the eloquence and learning of the clergy of the three Churches, the Irish landlords will wonderfully sympathize with that new act of settlement; and when the demand is made you will find that the right hon. gentleman will have to accede to it, or else he must take refuge in an alternative; but what the alternative is I will postpone for a moment saying.

What the alternative was, he stated a little further on. He supposed that when the Irish landlords and tenants and clergy of the three Churches combined in demanding some revolutionary settlement of the Irish Land Question from the Prime Minister, he must either accede to their proposal, or offer as an equivalent the disestablishment of the Church of England. What may have been the thoughts of the Irish Tories behind him, of such a Tory as Major Stuart Knox or Mr. Lefroy for example, as this transcendent farrago was uttered in tones of sepulchral solemnity! To be accused of having plundered the Church in consequence of having accepted Lord Stanley's settlement of the Tithe Question! To be accused of meditating leveling and communistic projects in regard to landed property! To be expected, hearing such things, to cheer them louder than anybody else in the House—for is not that the first duty of an Irish Tory at all times but especially now? Merely to meditate on such a situation must to some of these dogged, thick-witted men, be like a foretaste of insanity. In their secret hearts, they know that as Irish landlords, they are getting exceedingly good terms, and beyond getting such terms, beyond a regret for the forms of association connected



with the Establishment as a political institution, they care exceedingly little for it as a Church. While, however, they are anxious to be regarded as its heroic defenders, it is hard that they should be accused by their leader of having been its plunderers in the past, and of being willing to be its plunderers in the future. The impeachment is assuredly a true bill, but the Irish Tories may fairly be excused for feeling that it ought at all events to have come from the other side of the House.

Our hope, long ago avowed, was that Mr. Gladstone would have seen his way to combining a settlement of the Church and the Land Questions together, and far from figuring the Irish landlords as voluntarily assuming the communistic attitude predicted for them by Mr. Disraeli, we should have seen no objection to the cession of the tithe rent-charge absolutely to them as compensation for the passing of a really valid measure in regard to Land Tenure. But it must be admitted that to attempt to deal with two such questions at the same moment, might have been a work of peril even for Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship and his majority, and that such a measure might, at all events, have broken down in the House of Lords. Whereas it is clear he was able to see his way to a definite and speedy success with the question to which he has given precedence, and for the settlement of which public opinion in England and Scotland was best prepared. From the moment that the Irish Catholic Bishops resolved to reject the idea of any State provision for their clergy, it became free to him to deal with the question on principles accordant with those of the English and Scotch voluntaries; and so to produce a measure naturally uniting in its favour the full support of the Liberal party. Thus the preamble of the Bill is in reality the most important part of it, for it is a constitutional declaration of Parliament, which reverses and condemns the whole system of the Penal Laws, and of such legislation as the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, avowing instead the will of the Legislature that there shall for the future be absolute religious equality in Ireland. It says,—

Whereas it is expedient that the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland, as by law established, should be dissolved, and that the Church of Ireland, as so separated, should cease to be established by law, and that after satisfying, so far as possible, upon principles of equality as between the several religious denominations in Ireland, all just and equitable claims, the property of the said Church of Ireland, or the proceeds thereof, should be held and applied for the advan-

tage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion :

And it is further expedient that the said property, or the proceeds thereof, should be appropriated mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet so as not to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor :

And whereas her Majesty has been graciously pleased to signify that she has placed at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the several archbishoprics, bishoprics, benefices, cathedral préferments, and other ecclesiastical dignities and offices in Ireland, and in the custody of the same respectively :

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :—

And so forth.

The Bill then proposes to provide for the absolute disestablishment of "the Church of Ireland" in these terms :—

On and after the first day of January, 1871, the union created by Act of Parliament between the Churches of England and Ireland shall be dissolved, and the said Church of Ireland shall cease to be established by law.

On that day,

Every ecclesiastical corporation in Ireland, whether sole or aggregate, and every cathedral corporation in Ireland shall be dissolved ; and on and after that day no archbishop or bishop of the said Church shall be summoned or be qualified to sit in the House of Lords.

And again, on and after the same day—

All jurisdiction, whether voluntary, contentious, or otherwise, of all ecclesiastical, peculiar, exempt, and other courts and persons in Ireland at the time of the passing of this Act having any jurisdiction whatsoever exerciseable in any cause, suit, or matter matrimonial, spiritual, or ecclesiastical, or in any way arising out of the ecclesiastical law of Ireland, shall cease ; . . and the ecclesiastical law of Ireland, except in so far as relates to matrimonial causes and matters, shall cease to exist as law.

By these three simple clauses the process of disestablishment will have been absolutely effected on the 1st of January, 1871.

The intervening period between the passing of the Act and January, 1871, is left to the Irish Episcopalian Protestants to effect a new Church union, and construct a new Church body ; and it appears to be a very general feeling among them, which even received some countenance from Mr. Disraeli

during the recent debate, that by refusing to organize themselves anew they might place the Government in a position of some difficulty, when the date for final disestablishment shall have arrived. But a little consideration of the clause referring to the constitution of the new Church body will show that this idea is an utter delusion. According to the Bill, the disestablishment of the Church will inevitably take place on the 1st of January, 1871; but no date is assigned for the recognition of the new Church body. The clause regarding it runs as follows:—

*If at any time* it be shown to the satisfaction of her Majesty that the bishops, clergy, and laity of the said Church in Ireland, or the persons who, for the time being, may succeed to the exercise and discharge of the episcopal functions of such bishops, and the clergy and laity in communion with such persons, have, by arrangement amongst themselves, appointed any persons or body to represent the said Church, and to hold property for any of the uses or purposes thereof, it shall be lawful for her Majesty by charter to incorporate such body, with power, notwithstanding the statutes of mortmain, to hold lands to such extent as is in this Act provided, but not further or otherwise.

The effect of this clause is that in the case supposed of the Irish Protestants declining to form a Church body, then they will be placed in the same position in which Roman Catholics are at present placed, who have no legal incorporation or power to hold property except by trusteeship for Catholic purposes. The commissioners to be appointed by the Act, instead of handing over the private and other reserved property of the Establishment to such Church body, will hold and administer it until Parliament otherwise provides. Nor will the disestablished Church cease, by default of electing such Church body, to have a binding constitution and become a mere mass of warring atoms. The Irish Protestants have power to make a perfectly new Church if they please, so far as Act of Parliament can give it to them; but in case that they do not, it is provided that—

The present ecclesiastical law of Ireland and the present articles, doctrines, rites, rules, discipline, and ordinances of the said Church, shall be deemed to be binding on the members for the time being thereof, to the same extent and in the same manner in all respects as if such persons had mutually contracted and agreed to abide by and observe the same, and shall be enforced in the temporal Courts accordingly.

Disestablishment will not, therefore, it is plain, leave the Irish Protestant Church without a creed, so far as Parliament and the Court of Chancery can give it one; and it may be that Chancellor O'Hagan will yet have to enforce the au-

thority of the Thirty-nine Articles against some sect of Revivalist Dissenters projected by the Establishment in the agony of its collapse. The Bible, the Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, the Ecclesiastical Law remain binding on the Irish Protestants, as if they had contracted to conform to them, until such time as they choose, in their Church body, to adopt a different ecclesiastical constitution. If they were to decline to organize such a Church body, the effect would be that, after a time, the *quondam* "Church of Ireland" would cease to be an Episcopal Church, for the Bill prohibits the nomination of Bishops by the Queen in future, and makes no provision for their nomination in case a Church body should not be called into existence. The disestablished Church would thus dissolve itself into a strange system of dissenting sects—under which every congregation might have a ministry of its own. But, of course, it is vain to imagine such a prospect. The Irish Protestants are in a very stunned and sullen frame of mind. They feel that England has, for no fault of theirs, excommunicated and sent them adrift "un-houselled, unanointed, unannealed." They suppose that they have been treated ungratefully and even perfidiously, but they are not at all the people to prefer "no bread" to even "half a loaf;" and so soon as they have realized the fact that they are actually disestablished, we have no doubt that they will enter very eagerly into the details of disendowment.

Now, disendowment is very differently provided for in the Bill from disestablishment. It is proposed that the process of disendowment shall be immediate, and complete. From the day on which the Act of Parliament receives the Queen's assent, all the property of the Church of Ireland will become vested in commissioners, whose duty it shall be to pay off all the interests entitled to compensation, and to apply the residue to the ulterior objects of the Act. The principles upon which the Government proposes to proceed in this respect seem to be so eminently just that we do not feel called upon to discuss them. The Catholics of Ireland are at least entitled to the credit of absolute disinterestedness in the part they have taken in urging this great measure to a solution. They are willing that every Bishop, Dean, Prebendary, Rector, Curate, Proctor, Clerk, Organ-blower, Sexton, and Schoolmaster of the Establishment, however sinecure his present task, should have as liberal a compensation as the fairest actuary would accord to the most active civil servant. They do not ask the State to do less than right according to its own view of its compact with those who entered upon the service of the Irish Establishment while it was still a State Church. Even on the

considerable question whether compensation should be made to the interests arising under the vote of *Regium Donum* and the Maynooth Grant, from the Consolidated Fund or the surplus resulting from the disendowment of the Church Establishment, we repose confidence in the equitable disposition of the Government and of Parliament, feeling sure that there is a general desire at present to consider Irish interests generously on the part of both Government and Parliament, and that it is a point of policy as well as of good-feeling not to urge such questions in any litigious spirit. To one detail, which we take to be an error in the draft of the Bill, we may, however, here draw attention, as, if unnoticed, it might constitute a very unfair inequality. The 37th clause of the Bill says :—

When the annual parliamentary grant for the salaries of the theological professors of the College of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church situated at Belfast is discontinued, the commissioners shall, as soon as may be after such discontinuance, ascertain and declare by order the amount of the yearly salary theretofore received thereout by each such professor in the said College, and shall pay to each such professor, so long as he lives and continues to perform the duties of his present or any other professorship in the said College, an annuity equal to the yearly amount so ascertained as aforesaid.

The omission to which we call attention is doubtless accidental; but, as a matter of fact, there is no clause in the Bill saving in the same way the rights of the professors and officials of the College of Maynooth. Yet the difference between the title of a professor of Maynooth and the title of a professor of the General Assembly's College is like the difference between a covenanted and an uncovenanted civil servant in India. The Presbyterian College is a voluntary foundation, which came to be supplemented by a State grant. But Maynooth is a Royal College as much as Woolwich or Sandhurst, founded in deference to a definite principle of public policy, with a constitution resting on Charter and Acts of Parliament. We cannot be content that a specific recognition should be given to the rights of the professors of the Presbyterian College and that omission should be made of those of the great Catholic College.

A further proposal connected with the scheme of disendowment deserves grateful acknowledgment for its recognition of a very pregnant principle, which it is to be hoped will not remain an idle precedent. Mr. Gladstone proposes in selling the proprietary rights of the Church estates that a power of pre-emption should be provided for the tenants. "And what

is more" he says—"indeed, without this addition I do not think I could claim for this provision credit for anything more than good intentions—we further propose that in such sales three-fourths of the purchase money may be left upon the security of the land, and that the charge so remaining shall be liquidated by instalments, upon the principle adopted in the Drainage Act, by which we make the whole repayable in twenty-two years." This proposal will be a great boon undoubtedly to the tenants of the Church of Ireland. But who are they? We fear that when they have acquired the fee simple of their present leaseholds, they will by no means resemble that substantial peasant proprietary which the Premier evidently contemplates. As we glance down the lists of tenants given in the report of the Established Church Commission, we recognize the fact that the lands of the Church have been almost invariably let with a view to the strengthening of the Protestant interest in Ireland; and to Mr. Disraeli's mind this compulsory sale will present itself as the last and worst of Irish confiscations brought about by a combination still more pernicious than that of the Ritualists and Romanists, a combination of the Orange landlords and the Manchester party. The Duke of Abercorn will be one of the most presentable examples of the new Peasant Proprietary. He has got upwards of 6,000 acres of land under the Bishop of Derry at a rent of £70 a year, at present held on a lease of 21 years, subject to a renewal fine of £678. With the assistance of the State, by gradual instalments, His Grace will emerge from his present state of vassalage, and become the owner of his own acres. Sir William Verner's zeal for the Protestant interest was favourably considered by his Primate. In the prosperous counties of Armagh and Tyrone he holds about 3,000 acres of Church lands in perpetuity, at about three shillings an acre. Nor is Major Stuart Knox without a solid reason for his zeal. He has 700 good acres in Tyrone for £88 a-year. To him also a comparative independence is offered, if he will only agree to be a tacit party to confiscation. But will the Hamiltons, the Knoxes, the Verners agree to share in such sacrilegious spoil? We should hope not. No doubt they will, instantly after this measure is carried, ease their consciences by reconveying to the Protestant Church body, or to the Bishop of the diocese, the lands of which the State is impiously endeavouring to force the proprietorship upon them. That is the obvious way to show a true zeal for the Church. In a small way even Lord Palmerston was a Church tenant. At Rathmines he had a holding, of which the Return says the contents are



unknown, but which from the rental, £1. 11s. 4½d., might be taken to be a potato plot or cabbage garden. He too might, after a life of so many strange vicissitudes, have undergone the most startling metamorphosis of all, had he lived to see this measure carried, and found himself figuring at the end as an Irish Peasant Proprietor. It is to such hands, however, that the Irish Church Property will principally pass—to the nobility and gentry, who a century ago formed the Protestant Interest in Ireland, and who having from the first squatted and spread on the lands of the Church, seem now to be destined to absorb its spoil. The precedent, however, is a good precedent, though its application in this particular instance will little conduce to the benefit of the Irish people at large.

Mr. Gladstone may now be fairly congratulated on having successfully closed with the great moral injustice, which remained unredressed in Ireland. Something, even after the Protestant Church has been disestablished and disendowed, will remain to be done before religious equality can be said to exist in that country. There are still some fragments of the Penal Code embedded in the Statute Book; and England may yet with profit study the legislation of the dominion of Canada, in regard not only to processes of disestablishment and disendowment, but in regard to her future relation as a Protestant State with the hierarchy and the corporate organization of the Catholic Church. As the preamble of the Act, however, will have pledged Parliament to the observance of “principles of equality as between the several religious denominations in Ireland,” we cannot doubt that all laws or clauses of laws affecting the full civil or spiritual liberty of Catholics, will, in the course of next session, be swept from the Statute Book, so that on the 1st of January, 1871, when the process of disestablishment shall have been completed, the three great religious denominations may stand on precisely the same level in the eye of the law. Meantime we also trust that Mr. Gladstone will have addressed himself with the same earnestness, the same skill, and the same success to the great material injustice that he has shown in dealing with the great moral wrong of Ireland; and that by next Easter a just Land Law may have been carried by as large a majority as voted last week for Religious Equality.

## Notices of Books.

---

*Letter of Pius IX. on the Gallican Articles. Feb. 17, 1869.*

OUR readers will be much interested by the following Letter, addressed by the Holy Father to M. Gérin, a French judge ; who has published a volume called "Historical Researches on the Assembly of the French Clergy in 1682," which we hope to review in our next number.\*

"We receive, beloved son, with great pleasure, your historical disquisitions on the 'Declaratio Cleri Gallicani': both because under present circumstances they are more seasonable than [would be the case] otherwise ; and also because your very position as a layman and a magistrate places you above all exception, and secures the greatest authority for your dissertation

### \* "PIUS PP. IX.

"Dilecte Fili, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

"Libentissime excepimus, Dilecte Fili, historicas disquisitiones tuas in Declarationem Cleri Gallicani ; sive quia opportuniore quam alias accidunt fortasse præsentibus adjunctis, sive quia conditio ipsa tua laici viri et magistratus te facit omni exceptione majorem, et in materiâ, quæ minime blanditur plurimorum placitis, maximam lucubrationi tuæ conciliat auctoritatem. Quamquam vero multi satis perspicue ac solide demonstraverint, nec communem nec plerorumque fuisse anno 1682 in ita dictis Cleri comitiis sententiam, infensam Pontificiæ auctoritati et potestati ecclesiasticæ ; nec eam satis libere editam fuisse et ex animo, sed metu potius aut favore urgente ; nec diu constitisse, sed brevi fuisse revocatam ab iis qui eandem vel promoverant vel ediderant ; nec demum ullam inde partem fuisse Gallicanæ Ecclesiæ vel gloriam vel libertatem, sed potius labem aliquam inductam fuisse et veram servitutem ; quod tamen alii et temporum historia, et validis freti argumentis asseruerant, id te per indubia confirmasse monumenta gaudemus, cum hujusmodi opus non parum conferre debeat ad discutiendas præjudicatas opiniones, ad præcludendum cavillationibus aditum, ad suadendum denique omnibus, peculiare Ecclesias eo præstantiore vigere robore et fulgere splendore, quo studiosioris obsequii vinculo Romano Pontifici junguntur, cui Christus in Petro detulit primatum honoris, jurisdictionis, auctoritatis et potestatis in fideles universos. Hæc te in propugnandâ semper alacrius veritatis causâ confirmant ; et interim auspiciem gratiæ cœlestis Nostræque paternæ benevolentiae pignus excipe Benedictionem Apostolicam, quam tibi peramanter impertimus.

"Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum, die 17 Februarii 1869.—Pontificatus Nostri anno XXIII.

"PIUS PP. IX."

on a subject by no means acceptable to many. Several writers have demonstrated with sufficient clearness and solidity that the judgment expressed in the so-called assemblage of the clergy—a judgment so opposed to Pontifical authority and power—was neither that of all nor of the majority; that it was not the free expression of sincere opinion, but prompted by fear or obsequiousness; that it did not stand long, but was speedily revoked by those who had promoted or originated it; lastly, that neither glory nor liberty thence accrued to the French Church, but rather defilement and slavery. But that which others have asserted, resting on the history of the times and on valid arguments, we rejoice that you have confirmed by means of indubitable documents: since a work of this kind must greatly contribute to dispel prejudice; to shut out sophisms; to convince all, that individual churches are both more vigorous and more illustrious, in proportion as they are united more submissively to the Roman Pontiff; to whom, in the person of S. Peter, Christ gave the primacy of honour, jurisdiction, authority, power, over all the faithful. May this Letter strengthen you in ever defending more actively the cause of truth. Meanwhile, as a pledge of heavenly grace and of Our paternal benevolence, accept the Apostolic Benediction which we most lovingly impart to you.”

It will be observed that the Holy Father accounts this volume “perhaps more seasonable under present circumstances than would be the case otherwise.” Does this give colour to the general impression, that the First Vatican Council is likely to deal with the question of infallibility? However that may be, there can be no doubt that the Gallican controversy just now possesses a certain revived interest. Our readers therefore may be glad to see the four articles textually exhibited: and this the rather, because Denzinger omits the first of them, on the very strange ground that it does not bear on dogma.

“1. Beato Petro, ejusque successoribus Christi Vicariis, ipsique Ecclesiæ, rerum spiritualium et ad æternam salutem pertinentium, non autem civilium ac temporalium, a Deo traditam potestatem: dicente Domino ‘Regnum Meum non est de hoc mundo’: et iterum, ‘Reddite ergo quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei Deo’: ac proinde stare Apostolicum istud, ‘Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit; non est enim potestas nisi a Deo, quæ autem sunt a Deo ordinatæ sunt. Itaque qui potestati resistit, Dei ordinationi resistit.’ Reges ergo et principes in temporalibus nulli ecclesiasticæ potestati Dei ordinatione subjici; neque auctoritate clavium Ecclesiæ directe vel indirecte deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi a fide atque obedientiâ ac præstito fidelitatis sacramento solvi posse. Eamque sententiam, publicæ tranquillitati necessariam nec minus Ecclesiæ quam regno utilem, ut verbo Dei, patrum traditioni, et sanctorum exemplis consonam omnino retinendam.

“2. Sic inesse Apostolicæ Sedi ac Petri successoribus, Christi vicariis, rerum spiritualium plenam potestatem, ut simul valeant atque immota consistent sanctæ Œcumenicæ Synodi Constantiensis a Sede Apostolica comprobata, ipsoque Romanorum Pontificum ac totius Ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque ab ecclesiâ Gallicanâ perpetuâ religione custodita, decreta de auctoritate conciliorum generalium, quæ sessione quartâ et quintâ continentur; nec probari a Gallicanâ ecclesiâ, qui eorum decretorum, quasi dubiæ sint auctoritatis ac minus approbata, robur infringant, aut ad solum schismatis tempus concilii dicta detorqueant.

“3. Hinc Apostolicæ potestatis usum moderandum per canones Spiritu Dei conditos et totius mundi reverentiâ consecratos: valere etiam regulas, mores et instituta a regno et ecclesiâ Gallicanâ recepta; patrumque terminos manere inconcussos; atque id pertinere ad amplitudinem Apostolicæ Sedis,

ut statuta et consuetudines, tantæ Sedis et ecclesiarum consensione firmatæ, propriam stabilitatem obtineant.

“ 4. In fidei quoque quæstionibus, præcipuas Summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas ecclesias pertinere : nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium, nisi Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit.”

These four articles, as Denzinger mentions, were rejected by Innocent XI. by a Brief dated April 11 of the very year in which they were drawn up, 1682. On May 4, 1692, Alexander VIII. declared as follows :—

“ Omnia et singula, quæ tam quoad extensionem juris regalæ quam quoad declarationem de potestate ecclesiasticâ ac quatuor in eâ contentas propositiones, in supradictis comitiis cleri Gallicani a. 1682 habitis, acta et gesta fuerunt, cum omnibus et singulis mandatis, arrestis, confirmationibus, declarationibus, epistolis, edictis, et decretis a quibusvis personis sive ecclesiasticis, sive laicis, quomodolibet qualificatis, quâvis auctoritate et potestate, etiam individuum possessionem requirente, fungentibus, editis seu publicatis etc. ipso jure nulla, irrita, invalida, inania, viribusque et effectu penitus et omnino vacua ab initio fuisse et esse ac perpetuo fore ; neminemque ad illorum seu cujuslibet eorum, etsi juramento vallata sint, observantiam teneri ; tenore præsentium declaramus.”

Lastly, in the “Auctorem Fidei,” Pius VI. thus pronounces concerning the Synod of Pistoia :—

“ Neque silentio prætereunda insignis et fraudis plena Synodi temeritas, quæ pridem improbatam ab Apostolicâ Sede conventûs Gallicani declarationem anni 1682, ausa sit non amplissimis modo laudibus exornare, sed, quo majorem illi auctoritatem conciliaret, eam in decretum *de Fide* inscriptum insidiosè includere, articulos in illâ contentos palam adoptare, et quæ sparsim per hoc ipsum decretum tradita sunt horum articulorum publicâ et solemnî professione obsignare. Quo sane non solum gravior longe se nobis offert de Synodo, quam prædecessoribus nostris fuerit de comitiis illis, expostulandi ratio ; sed et ipsimet Gallicanæ ecclesiæ non levis injuria irrogatur, quam dignam Synodus existimaverit, cujus auctoritas in patrocinium vocaretur errorum, quibus illud est contaminatum decretum.

“ Quamobrem, quæ acta conventûs Gallicani, mox ut prodierunt, prædecessor noster venerabilis Innocentius XI, per litteras in formâ brevis die 11 Aprilis anni 1682, post autem expressius Alexander VIII, constitutione *Inter multiplices* die 4 Augusti anni 1690, pro Apostolici sui muneris ratione improbârunt, resciderunt, nulla et irrita declarârunt ; multo fortius exigit a nobis pastoralis sollicitudo, recentem horum factam in Synodo tot vitiis affectam adoptionem velut temerariam, scandalosam, ac (præsertim post edita prædecessorum nostrorum decreta) huic Apostolicæ Sedi summopere injuriosam, reprobare ac damnare ; prout eam præsentî hâc nostrâ constitutione reprobamus et damnamus, ac pro reprobatâ et damnatâ haberi volumus.”

---

*Civiltà Cattolica.* January—March, 1869.

FROM the beginning of this year, the “Civiltà” has been devoting two articles in each number to the coming Council. Considering the semi-official character of this periodical, we think our readers will be glad to have a taste of the quality of these articles. We subjoin therefore a few extracts. The first shall be from its number for January 16, on the Archbishop of Westminster’s pastoral, reviewed by us in January, 1868.

“ The Archbishop of Westminster’s letter on the Council has already been made known to our readers. It is not a simple pastoral, but a beautiful

theological treatise on the doctrinal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff; on the need in which both the Catholic Church and Christian society stand of an œcumenical council; and on the ample fruits which may be expected from it. Of this second part we gave a full review, or rather a compendious version, in our March number, 1868. From the first we also gave an extract in September, 1868, in an article entitled 'Pontifical infallibility and Gallicanism.' We have also printed and published an Italian translation of the pastoral. And we shall, therefore, do no more in this place than warmly recommend to our readers this tract upon the Council, which was one of the first published, and which for depth and precision will scarcely be surpassed by anything which may hereafter appear on the causes and effects of the future Council" (p. 2).

The next extract (Feb. 6) is addressed to the "*Civiltà*," by a French correspondent, and concerns the Catholic Church in France. We italicize a few passages\* :—

"The attitude of the French Government towards the future Council is the more worthy of attention, inasmuch as in the present state of Europe, it may have a direct influence on the material security of that great assembly.

"The Government is perfectly aware of this. Nevertheless it kept silence, and caused it to be kept by its official organs, until the session of the 10th of July, 1868, in which the *Ministre des Cultes* made some important declarations in the name of the Government in the Legislative Assembly.

"It appears from the speech of M. Baroche, that the Government will make no opposition to the assembly of the Council; that it is still undetermined whether or not it will send ambassadors, but that it is considering the question, and collecting historical precedents; that it is disposed to interpret favourably the omission of an invitation to the sovereign by name; that it rejects the idea of a separation between Church and State.

"These four favourable dispositions are balanced by others which are far less so. The minister declared that the Government repudiate the doctrine of the Syllabus 'which contains,' he says, 'certain propositions contrary to the principle by which the constitution of the empire is regulated.' He affirmed that 'The infallibility of the Pope alone is not admitted by the immense majority of the French clergy, nor by the immense majority of the episcopate.' He declared that the Government, in its relations with the Church, takes the Concordat as its basis, and the *organic articles*, which I place,' he says, 'in the same category.' He reserved to the Government 'full liberty of action in treating an undertaking which will be full of difficulties, and perhaps (which may God forbid) of dangers.' Lastly he said, 'We take our stand, as the French government has always done even under the old *régime*, on the Concordat. It is clear that after the Council a great question will present itself to the Government. Are the decisions of the Council to be admitted as a whole, or in part? And this is the most delicate question of all.'

"The bearing of the French government does not seem to have undergone any modification since the speech of M. Baroche. We may infer this, if from no other symptom, from the recent incident with regard to Mgr. Maret, and the book which he has thought fit to publish: the official patronage having been eagerly extended to a bishop who is accounted to be the champion of Gallican principles.

---

\* A vigorous attack on this French correspondent has been published in a journal called "*Le Français*," in its numbers for March 17th and 18th. In our next number we may possibly notice this attack.

“The French government fears that the future Œcumenical Council will affirm the doctrine of the Syllabus. It fears that the future Council will proclaim the dogmatic infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. It fears that the future Council will destroy the Organic Articles. It is remarkable that this three-fold apprehension is common both to the opposition and the Government. On this point the speech of M. Emile Ollivier and the reply of the minister are in perfect accordance.

“In a political point of view the French government is persuaded that the doctrine of the Syllabus is irreconcilable with the principle of the French Constitution. Therefore it resists the idea of the Pope’s dogmatical infallibility, and intends to arm itself against the ulterior decisions of the Council with the famous Organic Articles. These are indeed an arsenal in themselves. The first forbids any publication or execution in France ‘of Bulls, briefs, rescripts, decrees, mandates, provisions, or other missives from the Court of Rome,’ unauthorized by the French government.

“The third speaks thus explicitly : ‘Decrees of foreign synods, even those of general councils, cannot be published in France until the Government has examined their form, and ascertained that they are in conformity with the laws, rights, and franchises of the state.’ The tenth declares the abolition of whatsoever privilege implies the deprivation or attribution of episcopal jurisdiction. The eleventh suppresses all ecclesiastical institutes, except the Cathedral chapters and seminaries. The twenty-fourth prescribes as an obligation the teaching of the doctrine contained in the declaration of 1682. The fifty-fourth forbids curés to give the nuptial benediction ‘to those who do not prove in due and proper form that they have contracted matrimony before the civil magistrate.’

“So that with regard to the constitution which is supposed to be threatened by the Syllabus ; with regard to its relations with the Church, unhappily founded on the organic articles, with regard to an antiquated theological theory, on the ground of which it maintains the declaration of 1682, as the state doctrine ; the French Government is in a position of distrust towards the future Œcumenical Council.

“How far may it be possible to allay its fears and to change its distrust into confidence ? It is not easy to conjecture. Nevertheless we will hazard some important observations. The interpretation put upon the Syllabus is exaggerated and capricious, and founded upon a misunderstanding of its true meaning.

“However this may be, the refusal of the Government to allow the Syllabus to be published from the pulpit has not prevented that document from becoming known to all Catholics, *by whom it has been received in no other light than as a rule of faith.*

“The only result of that precaution has been to bring to light a difference between the Holy See and the French Government, which can in no way be considered as an advantage to the latter ; it being evidently the deepest interest of the Imperial Dynasty to preserve the sympathy of Catholics ; a sympathy which, except among party men, will never be wanting to it, whenever it shows itself sincerely devoted to the Holy See and to the Church. On the other hand, notwithstanding the official character of the organic articles as laws of the State, and of the declaration of 1682 as State theology, it is certain that the immense majority of the clergy do not believe one word of this declaration, and that the greater portion of the organic articles remain a dead letter. Obstinate to insist upon them would be to keep up a perpetual silent conflict and violent opposition between the State and the Church.

“Moreover, how without manifest contradiction, can the belief of that which is contrary to their deepest convictions be imposed upon Catholics by a constitution which proclaims liberty of conscience ?



“Again, were we to adopt the sentiments of the declaration of 1682, we should be constrained to admit the absolute supremacy of a truly Œcumenical Council. The Government cannot therefore, without violating and disavowing its own doctrine, show the slightest distrust of the future Council, which, without a shadow of doubt, will combine all the characteristics of universality. On the other hand, such distrust will not prevent Catholics from accepting its decisions. Instead therefore of adopting a demeanour of suspicion and reserve, the Government would take a course far more glorious to itself, far more favourable to its own interests, by unhesitatingly declaring itself the protector of the future Œcumenical Council. It would thus assume the attitude of Constantine and Theodosius in future history.

“At the present moment it would satisfy the immense majority of the people of France, which is Catholic; and would exercise an advantageous influence on the approaching elections, which are now occupying the attention of the Government.

“The demeanour of the Government has had its effect upon that of the French bishops, and has hitherto kept them in a state of isolated and silent expectation. With the exception of a well known letter of Mgr. Dupanloup, and of certain *mandements* published in the religious journals, no striking Act has yet proceeded from the Episcopate in reference to the future Council. A certain number of bishops have signified to their respective metropolitans their desire to meet together privately under their presidency, in order to come to a public reciprocal understanding concerning the needs of their dioceses, to consider necessary reforms, and to agree together on matters to be laid before the future Council.

“Their petition has not been attended by any result. It has perhaps been judged best, under present circumstances, that each bishop should make his preparations alone, in the full exercise of his free will, and without any direction save from God and his own conscience. If meetings of the bishops were to be held in preparation for the General Council, they would bear an absolutely private character, and would be rather an exchange of ideas than a conference properly so called.

“With a few exceptions of greater notoriety than authority, the doctrine of the French Episcopate, on the questions of the Syllabus and of Papal infallibility, is the same as that of all other Catholic bishops. . . . .

“It is but too well known that Catholics in France are unfortunately divided into two parties; Catholics, simply so called, and those who style themselves *liberal Catholics*. The population in country places has been untouched by this division. The same may be said of the cities in which the clergy and laity have taken opposite sides. The liberal Catholics are favourably regarded by the governing powers: not that the majority of liberal Catholics are partisans of the government; the contrary may be indeed affirmed. But they fear that the future Council will proclaim the doctrine of the Syllabus; they fear that it will proclaim the dogmatic infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff; and as the government shares these fears, it regards them with a certain degree of sympathy.

“Notwithstanding this well founded apprehension, the liberal Catholics cherish a hope that the future General Council may modify certain propositions of the Syllabus, or interpret them in a sense favourable to their ideas. They hope, moreover, that the question of the infallibility may either not be raised or at least may not be decided. A few weeks ago they gave utterance to the following words: ‘If the Pope be declared infallible, it will be necessary to change the expressions in the creed and instead of saying “Credo in Ecclesiam,” to say “Credo in Papam;”’ as if belief in the Church excluded belief in the Pope. They appear exceedingly dissatisfied with the preliminary labours carrying on in Rome in preparation for the future General Council, and make no secret of their distrust.

"*Catholics, properly so called, that is, the great majority of the faithful,* cherish directly contrary hopes. They have but one fear, lest the attempts of the enemies of the Church should prove successful in delaying, impeding, or disturbing the proposed assembly of the Council. They already submit, with all their mind and heart, to the decisions which shall there be promulgated. They are unanimous in their opinion of the expediency of such an assembly in an age when it is so necessary to recall the immutable truths to the memory of the wavering societies of men, and to draw more closely than ever the bonds of unity in the flock of Jesus Christ. They marvel at the courage which has called that great Council together in the midst of the revolutionary waves, and beseech Divine Providence to preserve it from all dangers.

"The presentiment of the political difficulties which may perhaps arise is combined, in the minds of many, with a certain calm confidence as to its happy issue. We may mention as a characteristic note the almost universal persuasion among Catholics that the future Council will be of short duration, and will resemble in this respect the Council of Chalcedon. This idea does not proceed only from the obvious difficulty in these days of keeping such an assembly long together, but from a persuasion that the bishops of the whole world will agree so entirely on the principal questions, that the minority, however eloquent it may be, will not be able to hold long in opposition. . . .

"With regard to dogma, I have already said that Catholics would desire that the doctrines of the Syllabus should be promulgated by the future Council. It is possible that the Council, affirming with the necessary explanations the propositions which stand in the Syllabus in a negative form, may completely dispel the misunderstandings which subsist, not only in the governing powers, but also in a number of minds, which, though highly cultivated, are not conversant with theological terms. Be this as it may, with the progress of time, prejudice will disappear; the eyes of men will grow accustomed to the light; and truth, being immortal, will triumph by its own strength. Catholics will receive with joy the proclamation by the future Council of the dogmatic infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. The notorious declaration of 1682 would thus be indirectly annulled, without the necessity of a special discussion upon those ill-omened four articles, which so long constituted the life of Gallicanism. No one however doubts that the Supreme Pontiff, from a feeling of dignified reserve, will be unwilling to take the initiative in a proposition referring directly to himself. But it is hoped that the unanimous manifestation of the mind of the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of the fathers of the future general Council, will define it by acclamation.

"Lastly, a large number of Catholics earnestly desire that the future Council may crown the homage offered by the Church to the Immaculate Virgin, by promulgating the dogma of her glorious assumption."

Lastly, on March 6th, the "*Civiltà*" itself remarks as follows on the *politico-religious* decrees which may be expected.

"It is most true, that the aspect in which we desire and applaud the work of the General Council is the very aspect in which others fear it, and account it pernicious.

"For what (they say) is to prevent these assembled Fathers from meddling with politics, and thus injuring those principles which society has recognized as the foundation of its daily life, and from which it is in no wise disposed to recede, seeing that almost all the present Governments of Christendom are founded upon them? Would not this be to throw a torch of discord between princes and people, and instead of sprinkling water upon their mutual exasperation in order to extinguish it, to pour oil upon the flame and make it

more furiously ? These fears have been expressed so loudly, that they have at last influenced certain well-meaning Catholics, who are afraid of everything, even of holy Church herself.

“ A few words of explanation on this point may, therefore, be of use.

“ We will say then, in the first place, that those who raise these difficulties must necessarily be in one of two conditions—either sincere Catholics untouched as to their faith in revelation, or else Protestants, Rationalists, Atheists, men, in short, devoid of Catholic faith. If the objector belong to the second class, we have only to say to him with sincere compassion : What reason can you possibly have for fear ? To you and your friends these definitions will be as though they had never been made ; and as you already despise the divine authority of the Church, and all the weighty truths which she proposes to you, you have little to add to the catalogue of those things which you despise. If you were influenced by conscience, you would have ground for fear ; because you are increasing your habitual malice by a fresh act, resisting a new ray of light by which God shows you the divinity of His Church, rejecting a new and a great grace by which God is knocking at the door of your heart. But as you care not for God, and as all your fears relate to temporal evils from which you are wholly safe and free, you may go on mocking the Church of Christ, so long as the Divine mercy, or the Divine justice, shall be pleased to bear with you.

“ But if the objection be raised by a Catholic, he must (excuse our plain speaking) be a Catholic ignorant of the first elements of his Faith. I would ask him : Do you believe the Church to be the Teacher of Catholics, the authoritative and infallible Teacher of truth ? If you understand the meaning of the words which you recite in the Apostles' creed : ‘ Credo in sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam,’ you cannot deny it. But how then can you fear that an authoritative, infallible Teacher should propound error instead of truth ? Nay, worse still, that she should not even know concerning what she has or has not authority to teach ? For on this turns the alleged objection, that the Church will meddle with politics : meaning thereby that the Church will undertake to speak of that which is beyond the sphere of her competence ; and that having entered upon an unknown field, she will, in ignorance of what she is doing, teach error instead of truth. But I would ask, if the Church is capable of making such blunders, what sort of a teacher is she ? How can her teaching be called authoritative ? how can we believe it infallible ? do you not see that, to have any value, this excuse must furnish a shelter for all heretics condemned by the Church ? They have but to say that the Church has stepped beyond her appointed sphere,—and that, therefore, they do not feel themselves bound in conscience by her decisions,—and they are free to set them at nought. Two things, then, are included in the Church's magisterium when she speaks authoritatively. The first is, that what she defines is infallibly true, what she rejects infallibly false ; and the second (without which the first cannot take place) is that those matters upon which she has pronounced, and under the aspect in which she has pronounced upon them, *are infallibly within the sphere of her competence*. Whence it follows, that to suppose the Church to interfere in matters which do not belong to her, is to be absolutely ignorant of the nature and office of the Church, and of the prerogatives conferred upon her by her Divine Founder.

“ Again, upon what subject have all these fears been excited ? Upon the subject of politics. In the minds of many, a vague sense lurks behind this word, which ought to be more accurately determined. To treat of politics is supposed by many to be the treatment of some of those modern principles which are the idol of the present day, the most efficacious instrument of the Revolution : such as the liberty, now so loudly proclaimed, of thought, worship, association ; non-intervention ; the separation between Church and State ; and the like. To treat of all these subjects is, according to them, to

enter upon the sphere of politics, a thing absolutely forbidden to the Church as beyond her province. If we did not daily read these assertions with our own eyes ; if we did not hear them pompously laid down by certain supposed authorities, who seem to be fully persuaded of their truth,—we should not believe that such things could be spoken or written : but when we hear them harped upon all the day long, we learn to estimate the wisdom of an age, which believes itself so especially illuminated. Why then, we would ask, should the Church be forbidden to treat all these subjects ? Ought they not to be regulated by the most scrupulous morality ? Or are principles contrary to that morality to be proclaimed to the world ? The truth, in fact, lies here : that if, among the faithful, no human opinions can be emancipated from the morality of the Gospel, far less can that morality abdicate its authority in the sphere of politics, the wide influence of which affects whole nations for good or for evil. To doubt this, is to question whether states as states, and governments as governments, are to be ruled by honest or dishonest principles, by moral or immoral laws. Now who but the Church is the authoritative judge of the honesty and morality of principles ? The atheist may deny the existence of morality ; the Protestant may say that he is a rule to himself ; but the Catholic, who, by God's mercy, abhors the impiety of the atheist, and rejects the absurdity of the Protestant, cannot but revere the Church as the supreme teacher of morality. If, then, he acknowledges this her magisterium, why should he be offended at its extension to the principles of political science ? . . . .

“We have an example in these days, among certain liberal Catholics, sufficient to open the eyes of all who are not wholly blind. Who could fail to be horrified by the proposal, that in Catholic countries the religion of Jesus Christ should be exterminated in the State ; that it should be deprived of all public influence ; and that society, as society, should be un-Christianized ? In former times a universal cry of reprobation would have greeted so infamous a proposal. But in our day this downright apostacy, being partly softened and partly concealed under the veil of a free church in a free state, certain Catholics receive it most benignantly, and account it (Heaven help them !) to be a progress in religion. Who, again, in former times, would have received without execration a proposal to give, in an entirely Catholic country, permission to every sect, however vile, to erect its temples and its altars, and to open its schools of instruction ? And yet, under the name of the enlightened and philosophical mildness of the age, independence of thought, and I know not what absurdities besides, these atrocities pass current, and certain well-intentioned Catholics are disposed to regard them as signal benefits conferred upon our age, and triumphant signs of progress.

“Here we see the immense evil incurred even by good men from contact with heterodoxy. But here, at the same time, we see the immense utility of a Council which will uplift its voice and crush error to the earth, trampling it out in all its lurking-places, and beating down all the intrenchments of the false moderation which clokes it. All doubts and diffidences which may suggest themselves beforehand will vanish before the face of clear, solemn, and infallible definition. Those who are and are minded to remain Catholics, when they understand that these doctrines are incompatible with faith, will reject them with horror, and will be confirmed in the truth. Those who shall wilfully persist in error, will be no longer able to shelter the malice of the will under the patronage of the intellect ; which, if it be not health, may be a means one day to its recovery, especially in that solemn hour when sickness and weakness silence the voice of passion, and dispose the dying man to receive the truth. And, in the more mournful case of those who may break altogether with the Church and forsake her communion, the grief occasioned by their ruin will be lightened by the thought, that they will be no longer an occasion of peril and destruction to their brethren.”

It may be worth while, in conclusion, to make one digressive remark, suggested by some of the above extracts. It is constantly urged by French officials, that the French Government is based on the principles of '89 ; and that it must resist therefore any disparagement of those principles, which the Church may attempt. Very prominent among those principles is the doctrine, that unlimited liberty should be permitted to public discussion on social and political theories, so long as individuals are protected from libellous attack. The French Emperor, however, in addressing the Council of State on March 23 (see *Times*, March 25, 1869), made a somewhat broad statement, which certainly conflicts with the principles of '89 as profoundly as the "Mirari vos" or the Syllabus conflicts with them. "It is *the duty* of the Government," he said, "firmly to *repress all subversive theories* ; which are both unlawful and culpable." The point at issue seems to be, not whether liberty of expression should be allowed to dangerous views, but who is to decide what particular "theories" *are* "subversive," "unlawful," "culpable," and proper objects for repression. We must be allowed to think, that the Church is an immeasurably better judge of such a question than any Emperor can be.

---

*The Future Ecumenical Council.* A Letter by the Bishop of Orleans to the Clergy of his Diocese. Translated by H. J. BUTTERFIELD and E. ROBILLARD. London : Washbourne.

THIS translation very serviceably prefixes Pius IX.'s Letter of approval. The Holy Father singles out for special approbation, Mgr. Dupanloup's exposition of "sound doctrine" on the Holy See's "supreme authority in such assemblies" ; his declaration of the Pope's solicitude for all who are in error ; and the proof which he exhibits, that the various Pontifical exhortations have had "but one end—the glory of God, the progress of the Church, and the true interests of" all.

We cannot do better than place before our readers a criticism of Mgr. Dupanloup's letter, which appeared in the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" of January 16, (pp. 211—213).

"To appreciate the value of Mgr. Dupanloup's letter, we must consider the object which he set before him, and which he himself explains in a letter to the '*Standardo Cattolico*,' prefixed to the Italian translation of his work. 'In this letter I have endeavoured to dispel the prejudices which have been already manifested with regard to this great event, and to convert all hearts, even those of our enemies, to a feeling of good will and confidence towards the Church. The letters which I have received from various countries lead me to believe, that my words may have been of some use ; while your unhappy country is one of those which has perhaps greatest need of the removal of misunderstandings and the tranquillising of passions.'

"After a magnificent exordium on the social greatness and importance of the Church of Christian Rome and of the future Council, which will perhaps be the greatest event of the nineteenth century, the letter is divided into eight sections. The first describes the divine organic constitution of the



Church ; her doctrinal infallibility ; her centre of unity and her hierarchy : he explains what a general Council is, and what is the authority of its Head : and treating particularly of the future Council, shows how the very material and political conditions of the present age are turned by Divine Providence, whether men will or no, to the good of the Church and to facilitating the celebration of the Council. In the second section he lays down the programme of the Council, commenting on these words of the Pontiff in the Bull of Indiction. 'The whole programme, the whole work of the Council, is contained in these words : it will have two great objects before it, *the good of the Church and the good of human society.*' Here he eloquently protests that the first object of the assembly of bishops will be to reanimate and give fresh youth to the interior life of the Church, beginning with the bishops. 'The Council is therefore assembled against, or rather, for us, before all others.' In the third, pointing out the causes of the future Council in the tremendous crisis, or (in the words of the Bull) the tempestuous whirlwind, which shakes both the Church and society,—he gives a vivid picture of the nineteenth century : showing at the same time its lights and its shadows ; its good and its evil ; the progress and errors of philosophical and political science ; the illusions, the perils, and the aberrations of human intelligence and human knowledge, under the sway of doubt and error. In the fourth, lest the reader should be discouraged by the picture of the nineteenth century, he gives a review of former ages, and sketches with a master's hand the century of the Council of Trent ; so that the present appears less mournful when compared with the past. Yet the Council triumphed over all, and renewed the face of the Christian world.

"In the present age, with all its good and all its progress, there are three maladies to be healed :—'The ruin of faith, occasioned by the fatal direction of scientific and philosophical studies ; the libertinism of morals, excited by a thousand new means of corrupt propagandism ; and lastly the unfounded suspicions which the enemies of religion take delight in fostering, between the Church and modern society. . . . Now these are the reasons why the Church, who is the friend of souls and who can never be indifferent to the evils of society, has arisen to their aid. Doubtless the Church and civil society are distinct [from one another : but as they walk upon earth side by side and number the same men as their children, their perils and their sufferings cannot but be in common. Now the Church summons her Council, because she feels that she has power to heal the common evils.'

"In proof of this he explains in the fifth section the aid offered by the Council ; he shows by the evidence of history the social and civilizing power of the Church ; the agreement between faith and science, the harmony between the Church and society ; and the need which the world has of the Church. It is vain to say that the Church is old and the times are new. Without making the slightest alteration in her creed, the Church brings out of her treasure-house things new and old, according to the need of every age : 'profert de thesauro suo nova et vetera.' And he concludes that 'the Gospel is the light of the world, and always will be,' and therefore the approaching Council will be a *sunrise* not a *sunset*. 'Why do you fear, therefore, timid Christians, and suspicious politicians ?'

"Thus, in the sixth section, he undertakes to dispel the unfounded fears with regard to the Council. To the believer it is sufficient to know that the Spirit of the Lord, notwithstanding human weakness, presides over such assemblies : but the eloquent bishop would reassure even the unbeliever ; and remove misunderstandings and suspicions, even from those who look upon the Council only under a human point of view. For the special benefit of those who have not the happiness of believing, he endeavours to show clearly by every kind of human argument that true *liberty, brotherhood, progress*, and all things that are truly good, have nothing to fear from this great senate of



mankind, as the Council may be called ; and to show the error of those who denounce the future Council as a menace, a declaration of war against modern society. It will be, on the contrary, in the words of the bishops addressed to Pius IX., 'grande opus illuminationis et pacificationis' for the Church and for society. To understand the true sense of the author and the art and triumph of his eloquence, it is necessary that in this paragraph more than in any other, we should keep in mind who it is that speaks ; to whom he speaks ; and, as we have said before, the point of view and the object which he sets before him. Otherwise he may be misunderstood ; and, in fact, the 'Constitutionnel' for example, thinks that it discovers in certain *eloquent generalities* of the letter, a programme of conciliation between the Council and the principles of '89, and an artful retreat from the doctrines of Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. with regard to certain boasted modern liberties. The 'Constitutionnel' believes that Mgr. Dupanloup wished to hint some wise counsels to the Church. The wise counsels are rather for the 'Constitutionnel,' and for any others who have need to be reconciled to the Church (see the 'Monde,' No. 29). The illustrious prelate then lays down other grounds for hope, from this great work of illumination and peace. Viewing the Council in the seventh section in its relation to the separated Churches in the east and the Protestant sects of the west, and with a heart full of charity and affection, he interprets the feelings and the Apostolical words of the Supreme Pontiff to the Orientals, the Protestants, and other non-Catholics. This passage is full of the eloquence of charity, the true eloquence of a bishop. Lastly, in the eighth paragraph he returns to the contemplation of the Catholic Church : the great blessings which we derive from her ; and the treasures of faith, hope, and love which we have in her and by her. 'And now, brethren, let us make an end of words, disputes, and fears ; let us rather kneel down and pray.' Thus the conclusion of the pastoral letter is a fervent exhortation to prayer for the happy issue of the Council.

---

*Tractatus de Papâ : ubi et de Concilio Œcumenico.* Auctore D. BOUIX.  
Paris : Lecoffre.

WHEN this admirable work is completed, it will constitute by far the most complete treatise "de Summo Pontifice" with which we happen to be acquainted. It is to be divided into eight parts : part 1st, on the Pope's monarchical power over the whole Church ; 2nd, on his infallibility ; 3rd, on his power in regard to an Œcumenical Council ; 4th, on his power over the temporalities of kings ; 5th, on his other divinely given prerogatives ; 6th, on his civil principedom ; 7th, on the canonical form of electing him ; 8th, on an Œcumenical Council. Of these eight parts, the present two volumes treat only three ; and it will need, therefore, we suppose, at least two volumes more that the work may be brought to a conclusion. We look with peculiar interest for the part with which the author's next volume is to begin ; on the Pope's power over the temporalities of kings. Many Catholics nowadays seem to forget, that the first of the four Gallican articles was occupied with denying the existence of this power ; and that this article was never mentioned by any Pope or theologian with less severity than the remaining three.

The reason of M. Bouix's treatise appearing at this particular moment, is

the appropriateness of exhibiting the true relations between a Pope and Œcumenical Council, at a time when a Council is so soon to assemble. We heartily concur ourselves with the opinion, assumed throughout by our author, on the infallibility of a Council. We do not consider God to have revealed two different doctrines ; viz. (1) the Pope's infallibility, and (2) the infallibility of an Œcumenical Council *confirmed* by the Pope : we accept the latter doctrine, simply as one application of the former. God has revealed that the Pope is infallible whenever he speaks *ex cathedrâ* ; and he speaks *ex cathedrâ* whenever he confirms the definitions of an Œcumenical Council. It is true indeed that bishops sit in a Council as true judges ; but they are not *infallible* judges, except in virtue of their accord with the Pope. (Vol. ii., pp. 604–7.) It is probable again that those who deny the infallibility of *conciliar* definitions, would be accounted by the Pope as *heretics* ; while those who deny his infallibility when speaking *alone*, would certainly *not* by him be so accounted. But the reason of this, we think, is merely that the Holy See, from motives of prudence, has hitherto abstained from *imposing* as of faith the full dogma revealed by Christ. Pontiffs have unmistakably *proposed* this dogma in many different ways ; as M. Bouix excellently shows in various passages of his work : but, for excellent reasons doubtless, they have not hitherto *imposed* it ; just as for many centuries they did not require belief in the Immaculate Conception.

It is difficult to make a choice from such a profusion of excellent matter as M. Bouix presents : but on the whole, the best sample, we think, of our author's manner will be his treatment of the well-known decrees of Constance on which Gallicans lay such stress (see vol. i. pp. 499–529). We do not happen to know any work, in which these decrees are at all so exhaustively considered. For ourselves indeed, as we said last October (p. 439), we thoroughly agree with F. Bottalla, in thinking that these decrees were never intended, even by those who carried them, as dogmatic definitions binding on the interior assent of Catholics. They were purely intended, we think, as a manifesto of the assembled Fathers, setting forth the ground on which they assumed the authority they were then claiming to exercise ; as the doctrinal preamble, in fact, to a disciplinary enactment. M. Bouix, however, does not insist on this consideration. He admits, at all events for argument's sake, that they were intended by their proposers as definitions of faith. Still they have, of course, no claim to infallibility, except so far as a Pope may have confirmed them ; and no such confirmation has been alleged, except that of Martin V. M. Bouix, then, carefully examines the circumstances of this alleged confirmation.

According to Gallicans, this Pope, in generally confirming all the conciliar decrees of Constance, implicitly confirmed the decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions : and by confirming them pronounced *ex cathedrâ*, both that an Œcumenical Council derives its power immediately from Christ, and also that God has subjected every Pope to the commands of such Council. Certainly if such a Pontifical definition were ever issued, it would be among the most vitally important decrees ever published by the Holy See ; and there can be no doubt that at least it would have been attended with every circumstance of particularity and solemnity. Even in the immeasurably smaller matter of condemning Huss and Wicklyffe (Bouix, p. 526), Martin V. put forth a

peremptory and unmistakable dogmatic Bull. But what were the circumstances of this alleged pro-Gallican definition? It was not even committed to writing under the Pope's own eye; nor did it so much as hint at the very doctrine, which Gallicans allege it to have decided. The circumstances were these. On the very last day of the Council (p. 524), after the bishops had been bid to go in peace, and after a preacher had ascended the pulpit to give a farewell exhortation, certain ambassadors entreated that a certain book might be publicly condemned before the Council separated. This book had nothing whatever to do with the relations of Pope and Council, but was alleged to contain various propositions injurious to kings (p. 527). It had been already condemned by the Council's "*deputati in causâ fidei*," and also severally by all the "nations"; but no conciliar decree had passed concerning it. The Pope declined to comply with their request; and at the same time, *in reply to that request* (*respondendo ad prædicta*), made the declaration out of which Gallicans have so strangely attempted to make capital. This declaration ran (p. 525) "that he willed to hold and inviolably observe all and singular the determinations, conclusions, and decrees in the matter of faith made *conciliarly* during the present Council, and never in any manner to oppose them; and he approves and ratifies those thus conciliarly made, and not [those made] otherwise nor in another manner." And he commanded this declaration to be entered in the Acts of the Council. The book had been condemned by certain *authorities* connected with the Council, but had not been condemned *conciliarly*. The Pope accordingly said to these ambassadors: "I refuse your request. I confirm nothing except what has been decreed conciliarly." It is difficult to imagine a more reckless display of party spirit, than is shown in calling such a declaration as this, made under such circumstances as these, an *ex cathedrâ* definition that God has made Council superior to Pope.

But now secondly. The very words of Martin V.'s declaration suggest by absolute necessity, that certain determinations in the matter of faith had been issued during the Council, but not conciliarly; and that these the Pope does *not* confirm. In fact the Pope's immediate purpose was to say this in reference to the above-mentioned book. Now even if Martin V. considered that the anti-Papal decrees of the Fourth and Fifth Sessions had been *in any sense* "determinations in the matter of faith;"—which we do not in the least believe—most certainly he knew that they had not been put forth *conciliarly*. Not to dwell on other points effectively raised by our author,—laymen and married men were admitted to vote on the occasion; and again the decision was not taken by individual votes, but by "nations." The partisans themselves of these decrees (p. 509) mention John XXIII.'s complaint, that the decisions did not go by the majority of votes, according to "*the custom of a General Council*"; i. e. were not put forth *conciliarly*. And they admit in their reply, that the majority of assembled bishops was actually *adverse* to these decisions. Even therefore if Martin V. had accounted these to have been in any sense doctrinal determinations, they most certainly fell under the class, which he declined to confirm as not having been pronounced conciliarly.

Lastly, if any doubt could possibly remain after what has been said, it

must be dissipated by what will follow. In the declaration to which Gallicans appeal, there is not (as has been seen) the most distant hint at any question which concerns the relation of Pope to Council. But in another document there is a very express treatment of this question. The ambassadors already mentioned, on the occasion which we have also mentioned,—viz. on the last day of the Council, April 22, 1418,—threatened appeal to a future Council, if the Pope would not comply with their request. They had already uttered the same threat on February 26th (p. 527), and on March 18th had been condemned by Martin V. for so doing. These are the words of his condemnation (p. 528) :—"It is not lawful for any one to appeal from *the supreme judge*, viz. the Apostolic See or the Roman Pontiff, *Christ's Vicar on earth*, or to refuse acceptance of (*declinare*) his judgment in causes of faith." Contrasting then expressly Pope with Council, Martin V. had solemnly declared on March 18th that the former is supreme judge ; is Christ's Vicar on earth ; is irreformable in his dogmatical judgments. And yet, according to Gallicans, on April 22nd—just one month afterwards—the same Martin V. in the very act of protesting against these same appellants to a future Council, defined *ex cathedrâ* that he is *not* supreme judge ; that he is *not* Christ's vicar on earth ; but that he can only act as vicar ("*vicarius post obitum*," we suppose, as Councils are not often sitting) of an Œcumenical Council. Can prejudice and unreason go further than this ?

We have given our readers, we think, a fair specimen of the excellence and completeness with which M. Bouix does his work.

Admirable however as this treatise is, its most friendly critics have made one or two adverse comments, which we cannot deny to have some foundation. The "*Revue Catholique*," e.g., in the first number of its new and enlarged series, thus speaks :—

"Long as this section is [which treats Pontifical infallibility] there are regrettable gaps in it. In the first place, the author need not have remitted to a different treatise (that on the Church) what he has to say on the *object* of infallibility ; the present, we think, would have been no unfitting place for it. But above all, he should have explained at greater length what it is to speak *ex cathedrâ* ; what conditions are required for that purpose. This very important question has occasioned in our time long and delicate controversies. He should have made us acquainted with these controversies ; and should have pointed out the inconsiderate tendencies of certain modern writers, towards divergence from the traditions and teachings of our great theologians" (p. 115).

It seems to us indeed, that M. Bouix has never given his mind to the momentous questions which have recently been raised, in connection with the object matter of infallibility. His instincts, as might have been expected, are to the extremest views held by orthodox Catholics on its extension ; but we think he has never placed before his thoughts any distinct and consistent theory on the matter. As an instance how large is his ascription of infallibility, he considers that every doctrinal decree of a Pontifical Congregation is to be accounted the Pope's infallible *ex cathedrâ* utterance, if it is supposed by the "accustomed clause :—" *et factâ per me infra scriptum relatione Sanctissimus confirmavit*" (vol. ii. p. 473 ; cf. pp. 476, 469) : a clause, in

to add (pp. 476-7), which has hardly ever been omitted, except in the decree against Galileo. In one sense indeed, our author is almost forced to this opinion. For, as we mentioned in January (p. 224), he thinks that no firm interior assent can be due to a decree not strictly infallible: an opinion often expressed by him throughout these two volumes. If therefore he did not consider the doctrinal decrees of a Pontifical Congregation to be almost always strictly infallible, he could not hold that the firm interior assent of Catholics is due to their teaching: and this conclusion would, of course, be most repugnant both to his judgment and his feelings. We have spoken in our present number on the firm interior assent due to declarations which are not strictly infallible; and we would refer our readers to what we have said in the passage to which we allude. See pp. 381-383. Another instance may be cited of the extension which M. Bouix ascribes to infallibility. In proving that the Pope's monarchical power "has been *defined* in effect" (vol. i. pp. 214-216), he cites, not only the Œcumenical Councils of Lyons (2nd), Florence, and Trent, but (interspersedly with these, and as though just of the same authority) Pius VI.'s Brief "*Super soliditate*"; his *responsio super nuntiaturas*; and his Letter to an individual bishop. It is true indeed, on the other hand, that he occasionally speaks as though the Church's infallibility were confined to definitions of faith. But that this cannot possibly be his meaning, is demonstratively certain, from his view already mentioned about the Pontifical Congregations. And in fact (see e.g. vol. i. p. 235) when he explains what he *means* by "definitions of faith," his full orthodoxy on the matter becomes most evident. Those Pontifical declarations, and those only, are excluded from being definitions of faith, which "*in no respect appertain to faith*"; as, for instance, *sentences of deposition pronounced against bishops*, and the like." We believe that many theologians—as particularly Ballerini—have used the phrase "definitions of faith" in this extremely wide sense, and have thereby caused much misconception of their meaning.

The second unfavourable criticism of M. Bouix to which we referred, has been made, not only by the "*Revue Catholique*," but by a still greater authority the "*Civiltà Cattolica*." That periodical, in its number for Jan. 16th—while giving the author, on the whole, quite an enthusiastic tribute of admiration—says that he "expresses severe animadversions not on things only but on persons"; that he spares neither the much-admired Bossuet, "nor certain members of illustrious religious corporations" (p. 214). Then, the "*Revue Catholique*" having said afterwards something of the same kind, the "*Civiltà*" of February 6th returns to the charge (p. 356), and speaks more explicitly than before of M. Bouix's "too harsh and bitter words."

We cannot deny that there is truth in these strictures. Take e.g. the particular case to which the "*Civiltà*" evidently alludes. We speak of the author's criticism on those French Jesuits, who upheld the four Gallican articles; who supported the king against the Pope in the matter of the "*Regale*"; and who combined against the rule of their General (vol. ii. pp. 77-110). It is impossible, of course, to defend such conduct. Still we believe there was not the faintest whisper of anything among these religious, ever so distinctly approaching what is commonly called immorality. It is surely strange

language then, to speak of them (p. 77) as "abandoned men (*perditi*) and unworthy the name of religious"; to describe them as guilty of "*pudenda adulatio*" towards Louis XIV. (p. 86, note); and to add (p. 109), that men ought to be "ashamed of appealing to the authority of such abandoned persons," who were in fact "rotten members of the Society."

However, we must not conclude our notice with words of disparagement. M. Bouix has done invaluable service, in exhibiting a vast quantity of matter which (we believe) was never brought together before, and which tends most powerfully to the establishment of anti-Gallican orthodoxy. We sincerely hope that he may accomplish his whole design with as complete success as has attended this his first instalment. And, finally, we venture to hope that he may even *enlarge* his original plan, by adding a separate volume, "*de infallibilitatis extensione*."

---

*On the Apostolical and Infallible Authority of the Pope when teaching the Faithful, and on his Relation to a General Council.* By F. X. WENINGER, D.D., Missionary of the Society of Jesus. New York: Sadlier.

THIS work is of very similar character with the invaluable series on which F. Bottalla is now engaged: still it is addressed to a somewhat different class of readers. F. Bottalla's treatises require, for their appreciation, painstaking thought, and unusually careful attention; and they are written therefore for a more highly educated class than F. Weninger addresses. But our present author enjoys the compensating advantage, of addressing a much larger audience; because all will be able sufficiently to follow his cogent and interesting argument, who possess the ordinary faculties of educated men.

F. Weninger is exclusively engaged with the infallibility question; considering (see "Introduction") that "there are already within the reach of all, standard works upon the Divine institution of the Papal supremacy." In regard to infallibility—as our readers by this time know well—there are three different questions to be considered by Catholics. Firstly, in whom does it reside? e. g., in the Pope alone, or in Pope and bishops unitedly? Secondly, how far does it extend? Is it confined, e. g., to a testification of revealed verities? or does it include within its sphere a large number of truths,—primarily philosophical, physical, political,—whose firm reception is important for *protecting* the Deposit? Thirdly, how is its voice uttered? Only in Conciliar definitions and dogmatic Bulls? or also in Briefs, Encyclicals, and Pontifical Letters to this or that individual? On all these questions F. Weninger upholds what we must emphatically characterize as the orthodox doctrine. But as his direct purpose is rather to treat the first than the second and third, we will pass briefly over the two latter.

In his "Introduction" (p. 8) he claims "the infallible authority of the Pope" as extending over "scientific questions . . . so far as these touch directly or indirectly upon the deposit of faith and upon its *preservation*."



Immediately afterwards he gives an excellent definition of an *ex cathedrâ* judgment : a matter on which some even eminent theologians have at times spoken unadvisedly. The Pope, he says, speaks *ex cathedrâ*, whenever he "is teaching the faithful as the head of the Church and the expounder of her doctrine" ; whenever he "solemnly pronounces *upon* the teaching of the Church." In a later portion of his volume, having referred (p. 191) to "the prerogative of the Papal infallible authority," he adds (p. 194) that Gregory XVI. "exercised . . . . this authority against Lamennais and Hermes" : i. e., in the "Mirari vos" ; and in the Brief "Ad augendas," to which we referred in January, 1868, p. 233. F. Weninger then proceeds to adduce, as further instances of infallibility, Pius IX.'s condemnation of Günther and Frohschammer : and adds finally, that the same Pontiff has spoken in *the Syllabus* as "the expounder of the eternal truths revealed by God to man" ; as "armed with the power of the Most High" ; as "fulminating the thunders of his anathemas against all who dared dispute his decisions." We may be permitted further to mention, that to the copy of his work sent us for review he has prefixed a short inscription, expressing a very kind and handsome appreciation of our own humble labours "in the cause of the Holy See."

The more direct purpose of his volume however is to assail, not minimism, but Gallicanism. In regard to an Œcumenical Council, he holds with M. Bouix (see our preceding notice) that its infallibility is but one particular application of Pontifical infallibility ; that in the Pope, and in no other man or body of men, God has vested this prerogative. After a brief but forcible exposition of the Scriptural evidence, he proceeds (chap. ii.) to the testimony of the Fathers ; and thence (chap. iii.) to that of all the Œcumenical Councils. This third chapter is peculiarly interesting ; for the author goes through every one of the Councils without exception, showing the testimony afforded by each to Pontifical infallibility. He concludes the chapter with this striking passage :—

"We cannot conclude this rapid sketch of the General Councils, without alluding to the illustrious assembly of more than two hundred bishops, who met at Rome in the year 1854, to assist at the solemn definition of the Immaculate Conception. During the last session, after all the theologians had argued the point upon the subject with great depth of wisdom, all the bishops, as though moved by one and the same spirit, turning towards Pius IX., broke out into the exclamation : 'Peter, teach us !' 'Petre, doce nos !'

"This spontaneous and unanimous acclamation showed that, according to the convictions, grounded on faith, of these two hundred bishops, it was not the reasoning of the Doctors and neither their own theological science and ability, and neither their common view already previously expressed in their writings to the Holy Father, but that it was his sole and own judgment—his faith, which they addressed, in order to hear, through his mouth as the organ of the Holy Ghost, what they and the whole Church were required to believe in this matter to be a 'dogma of faith' " (p. 153).

F. Weninger's fourth chapter is on the testimony of the Popes themselves. At starting, somewhat to our surprise, he half apologises for this argument, because it might seem (p. 154) "to constitute them judges in their own

cause." But surely no other proof of Pontifical infallibility exceeds that derived from the undeviating demeanour of Popes in every age. From the very first down to this nineteenth century, each Pope has comported himself, as one possessing that very prerogative which the more orthodox Catholics ascribe to him. This is surely among the strongest possible testimonies, to the existence of an Apostolic tradition on the Ultramontane side. The fact itself is most conclusively established by F. Weninger ; and he especially drew attention to the attitude always exhibited by a Pope to an Œcumenical Council.

"Had the Popes not known themselves to be in possession of an entirely indisputable right, when claiming to be the Supreme Judges in matters of faith, all circumstances of time, places, and persons, would have induced them, in all human prudence, to assume, while facing those Œcumenical Councils, quite a different stand, and to pursue quite another course of proceeding, than they actually did.

"Reviewing the history of the Œcumenical Councils, the Popes at every step defied the Fathers of those Councils to do anything further than acknowledge this sublime privilege of the Holy See of S. Peter at Rome.

"We remember the examples of a Leo, Agatho, and the two Adrians. They even did not permit so much as the change of an 'iota' in their professions of faith, no matter if even the same truth were expressed. They acted so in the face of the Greeks in the Far East, whose prejudices against the Western Church were known to them. They acted so, opposed by mighty adversaries, who often were protected by the whole strength of the Imperial power ; and, how remarkable ! no one dared even to say a word which would have called in question the Apostolical authority of the See of Rome as the Supreme Tribunal in matters of faith " (pp. 155, 156).

The fifth chapter is supplementary of the fourth. Having shown how expressly the Popes claimed infallibility, the author proceeds to show how plainly they *acted* on that claim ; how evident it is, on the very surface of history, that the Popes, "in all centuries, definitely, by their own authority, condemned heresy and errors" (p. 176). They summoned a Council whenever they might think it expedient : whether that expediency arose from the nature of the case, or from the importance of gratifying some orthodox emperor who might have taken a fancy for a Council. But no man can allege, that any Pope ever spoke one whit less peremptorily when condemning an error by his own personal *ex cathedrâ* judgment, than when confirming the damnatory decree of a Council.

We will not pursue further our analysis of the volume, for we have said enough to make our readers see its value and importance. In the United States, no less than in these islands, a higher and more orthodox type of Catholic doctrine seems rapidly gaining the ascendant. To God be the praise !

---

*Catholic Truth Society.* Central Depôt, 27, Wellington Street, Strand.

**W**E pointed out, in our July number of last year, that the Catholic Church in England is making large gains among the higher classes and among the clergy of the Protestant Church, but is comparatively making but little way among the middle and lower classes. For this we gave obvious reasons. We then suggested that two instruments of propaganda might most advantageously be introduced, which would naturally tend to bring the Catholic religion more closely under the notice of those who seem to be least easily accessible to Catholic influences. One of these instruments was the more general organization of women, who, though not enclosed as Religious, should be bound together systematically to penetrate the society of the humbler classes, and recommend this faith to them by the fruits which they should see and taste of this good work. The other instrument which we recommended, nay, urgently called for, was a "Catholic Tract Society," which should, in the cheapest form, through means of the press, provide an explanation of Catholic doctrine and an antidote to anti-Catholic prejudices.

Within a year of the suggestion such a society has come into existence. Two or three persons set themselves to the task; and one especially (F. Herbert Vaughan) who is ever exhausting himself in labours for the Church and for souls. These persons invited subscriptions and membership; drew up a number of short tracts under various headings; and, by the beginning of January, the "first instalment of the papers of the Catholic Truth Society" was advertised and published. The following appears to be the main characteristics of the papers which have hitherto appeared:—1st. They are chiefly short selections made from standard authors. Thus there are excellent pages taken out of Dr. Lingard's Catechism, which, for combining a popular, lucid, and learned explanation of Catholic doctrine, has been perhaps nowhere excelled. Next there is a group of moral or spiritual "papers," none of which exceed two pages, from F. Faber's writings. They have been well selected, and may be profitably distributed among all classes, of rich or poor, learned or uneducated. The "Furniss Papers" refer to the sick-room; and will, no doubt, be largely increased in number and variety. Perhaps no writer has been more popular, nor effected more conversions among the artizan and lower orders, than Cobbet: the Society has done well, therefore, to make selections from his writings, and to call the lot by the name of "Cobbett Papers." "The English and Irish Martyr Papers" are extracts or compilations from Dr. Challoner's "Lives of Missionary Priests," and an interesting work by Major O'Reilly. Each "paper" exemplifies some virtue, and bears its own moral. There is a reality and a national interest attaching to them, which is well adapted to inspire interest and to promote their circulation. "True Wayside Tales" form the only section of purely original matter. The one on the "Workhouse Children" ought to be scattered all over England; it reveals facts which persuade the heart to obtain justice and redress for those who thus cruelly suffer, and should be

put into the hands of the magistrates and managers of every workhouse. "What a Child can do," and "What will People say?" are pleasing narratives, which will encourage many who are on the threshold of the truth. Then follow "Doctrinal Papers;" "Songs and Ballads," both of which are exceedingly well done, especially the touching ballad of the Irish girl, called "Sister Clare," by Lady G. Fullerton. "The Deathbed Scenes," we hope, will be numerous added to.

Secondly, the next characteristic of these "Papers" is that they have the advantage of being exceedingly short: not one exceeds eight pages in length; the greater number are confined to four pages.

Thirdly, they are a prodigy of cheapness. The Protestant Religious Tract Society itself, with all its resources, with its own paper mills, and its own printing presses and machinery, has produced nothing cheaper than the "Papers" of the Catholic Truth Society. It appears that 400 pages, often of closely printed matter, are sold for one shilling; and that members of the society, i.e., annual subscribers of one pound, can obtain their 100 of the shorter tracts for less than sixpence, and 800 pages of letter-press for one shilling and sixpence. Certainly it cannot be said that their *price* stands in the way of their freest and widest circulation.

The only criticism which we have to make upon the "first instalment" which lies before us is, that the papers it contains are somewhat too refined for the coarser and rougher tastes of the lower classes. Sensational tales, hair-breadth escapes, terrible catastrophes, in which some good moral or truth is conveyed, are the intellectual food which a large class of the uneducated delight in. Then, again, the language and illustrations which are most familiar to this class, might be advantageously introduced into certain tracts. The danger is that while an educated class is supplying for one class of persons, another and a lower class should be missed altogether, owing to the tone of the tracts being above them and not on their own level. We believe that F. Vaughan is fully alive to this practical defect, and desires to remedy it; nevertheless, we call attention to it, and express a hope that persons may be found to write at least a certain number of tracts in the sense and style we have just indicated.

As to the means of circulation—some very useful and ingenious hints are given in a fly-sheet by the Society. We make the following extracts:—

1. "'Papers' suitable for Catholics upon the Doctrines of Faith, the Sacraments, Preparation for Death, Sufferings, Bereavements, &c., may be distributed in visits to the sick and poor by the Parochial Clergy, by Sisters, members of S. Vincent of Paul's Society, or by all who visit the poor, whether in towns or villages, or the country.

4. "'Papers' replying to the common popular prejudices may be advantageously distributed on Sunday afternoons in the parks and other places of public resort or amusement. For this purpose members of various Catholic institutions, such as the Young Men's Institute, or respectable persons of either sex, may be charitably disposed to come forward and lend their services for an hour or two, or more, on the Sunday afternoons.

5. "Good Catholics living in the neighbourhood of the great centres of work, such as the dockyards, the Woolwich and other arsenals, the mills in Lancashire and Yorkshire, the manufactories in Glasgow, Birmingham,

Northampton, and other large towns, the potteries in the middle of England, and the mining districts in Cornwall, South Wales, and the North of England, should provide themselves with the Society's 'Papers.' Zeal and prudence will suggest the most suitable manner in each locality for circulating them. Some of the 'Papers' may be fittingly sown broadcast in town and country, while the distribution of 'Papers' which speak of those Sacred Truths which non-Catholics are wont to ridicule, and even blaspheme against, should be checked by the recollection of the Divine injunction, 'Cast not your pearls before swine.'

6. "Another means of circulation among the poorer classes is to hire window-panes in shops situated in the midst of such populations, at the rental of 6d. or 1s. a week. The panes should be provided with the CATHOLIC TRUTH MAGAZINE, and with such of the Society's 'Papers' as may be most useful, instructive, and amusing. Charitable persons, by setting up such little stores, at the wholesale price, might assist the seller to realize a considerable profit upon the retail sale. The sale of the penny and halfpenny 'Papers,' &c., would lead to the sale of Catholic books. And thus prejudices against the Church will by degrees be dispelled, and Catholic Truths accepted in their true sense and meaning. The higher classes in our congregations may easily establish such little depôts of Catholic reading among their poorer neighbours in their respective localities; and they may also provide hawkers with the same cheap publications."

But in addition to these suggestions, there is another plan which the enterprising Catholic firm of Messrs. Austin & Oates, of Clifton, have set in motion. They have started a hawker and cart for Clifton, Bristol, and the neighbourhood, and by this means they carry all manner of cheap and wholesome Catholic literature into the midst of the people in every kind of locality. We hope that this good example will be followed largely wherever there is a wide-spread and considerable population.

In addition to the tracts, or as they are more happily called "papers," the Society publishes every month a magazine, of which the price is one penny. It is well written,—many of its articles are models of as pure and simple an English as anything we know;—and the choice of subjects is good, and to the point. We are inclined to think that, considering the class of persons for whose instruction it is intended, the introduction of a tale or serial would add to its popularity, and hence to its circulation and consequent efficiency.

---

*Honour thy Father in Work and Word, and all Patience.* A Discourse preached in the Chapel of Houghton, at the Funeral of the Honourable Charles Langdale, S.J., Dec. 9, 1868. By Father Gallwey, S.J. Burns, Oates, & Co.

IT would be an easy matter to speak of this sermon, which is one of rare interest, being both in itself extremely beautiful, and also crowded with authentic and most valuable details, as to a religious life and character in a high degree uncommon, instructive, and exemplary. But at this moment it is impossible to resist the attraction which draws us rather to speak of

Mr. Langdale himself ; and of him it is no easy task to any English Catholic either to write, speak, or think in a manner to satisfy himself.

It is not merely by those who had the privilege of his personal friendship that this is felt. There is hardly a Catholic household in England in which his departure from us is not felt as something like to a personal loss. In almost every generation there are public men about whom there arises a feeling something like this : men who, in their earlier years, have won general respect and admiration by public services, and who, from the accident of their having been spared beyond the ordinary age of man, come, in their latter years, to occupy in the minds of their countrymen a place which combines the warm regard and reverence felt towards distinguished contemporaries, with the curiosity with which we think of men of a by-gone generation. There is no man of our day towards whom such feelings are entertained by English Catholics in a degree approaching those which, for many years past, have centred round Mr. Langdale. The very period measured by his life would be enough to excite interest. When he was born the *ancien régime* was in full possession throughout Europe. Not yet had been heard the distant roar of the thunders of that great revolution which has engrossed all the interest of European history for eighty years. Very few are now left to tell, from their own recollection, how men felt in its earlier years. To English Catholics especially, his were most important years. When he was born the penal laws were all but intact. When he died they were all but removed. And the Catholics, on whose behalf Burke had pleaded for the removal of those laws, expressly on the ground that they were a mere handful, had become, we do not say a very large body, but the only religious body which is making rapid progress ; while all the conflicting sects around, agreeing in nothing else, agree in this, that the influence of the Catholic religion is the only religious influence they fear. As to Ireland, again, the change was even greater. He remembered the time, when that name expressed a nation trodden down under the iron heel of an Orange faction ; and the last event of his life was the accession of a new ministry, called to office by a great majority of the constituencies in each of the three kingdoms, expressly for the purpose, not merely of removing the Protestant Establishment, but of carrying out a system of legislation upon all important questions, in accordance with the tastes and wishes of the Irish people.

During the course of this great change there was no time, so soon as his age allowed, at which he was not one of the chief laymen who acted and spoke on behalf of the Catholic Church, and for many years past his has been the one name, which would have been given without a rival by any one who had been asked that of the leading Catholic layman in England. The fortunes of English Catholics with regard to the British Parliament he exactly shared. He was one of the first elected to Parliament ; and if the revulsion of anti-Catholic bigotry soon prevented his re-election, it has ever since made it impossible for any other Catholic to obtain a seat, unless under circumstances so exceptional as to give no indication that that bigotry is as yet diminished. For if we would trace the change in the position of British Catholics, which took place during Mr. Langdale's life, we must note that in his youth, although they were still subject to almost all the legal disabilities



imposed by the penal laws, there was a rather general feeling of sympathy and good-will towards them. He dies, leaving them as nearly as possible on terms of legal equality with their countrymen, but the object of a social persecution, which we suppose was never more bitter. The reason is plain—eighty years ago they were despised and pitied; in our day they are feared and hated.

No man, who had been our leader so long, and through times so critical, could have passed out of this world without painfully exciting our interest and sympathy. But Mr. Langdale has long held a place in our hearts for a reason much more weighty. While actually writing these lines we have been much struck with two articles in the *Spectator* (a paper edited by men of very vague and limited creed, but of more religious earnestness than any other Protestant paper we know), in one of which the writer, after stating what he thinks ought to be the feelings of Christians about missions to the heathen, concludes: "This, we think, should be the tone of any Christian legislature in discussing such subjects. It is not the prevailing tone of the House of Lords. But then is the House of Lords, or indeed any other assembly of practical Englishmen, in spite of the Church Establishment, on the whole a Christian assembly?" In the same number it is said, with especial reference to leading British statesmen, "We are quite sure that there are thousands of criminals far less guilty in the sight of God than numbers of respectable, and even eminent men of the world, to whom we all owe and feel that we owe a great debt of gratitude." These testimonies force upon us a comparison between Protestant and Catholic countries. No one will say that Catholics are all they should be; but we may say, thank God, that neither in England or any other country of the world could there be a Parliament of Catholics upon which the first of these sentences could be pronounced. There have been, and may be again, Parliaments composed of men who ought to be Catholics, which are even less Christian than the House of Lords. But that is because in too many Catholic countries there are men who, knowing the Catholic religion, but not being Christians at all, are, not indifferent, but bitter haters of it. The peculiarity which the *Spectator* points out in assemblies of Englishmen is, not that they consciously dislike Christianity, still less that they hate it; and (like bad men in Catholic countries) would, if they could, wholly root it out of the earth; but that, although not exactly disbelievers themselves, they consciously consider Christianity as a thing which ought not to interfere with the practical business of life. No class like this exists in any Catholic country. And in such a state of society it is in no way wonderful that leading statesmen and public benefactors should often be, as the writer complains, "in the sight of God" far more guilty than thousands of criminals. Now, the peculiar fitness of Charles Langdale to be so long the recognized head of the Catholic body in England was, not only that he was not a man of that class, but that he was, as far as man can see, perhaps the most thoroughly and consistently Christian character in their whole body. It was the universal belief of this, not any extraordinary brilliancy of talents, not his having filled high offices, or done splendid services to his country, or even

to the Church, that made him so peculiarly acceptable as a leader and representative to all classes, both of our clergy and laity.

And yet we suppose there were, till now, not more than two or three persons living who knew the extent to which his whole inner life was supernatural. The publication of Father Gallwey's sermon has produced an impression, in its measure resembling that produced by the publication of the *Vie intime* of Lacordaire. Men who for years had known and honoured him, now find that they have been in intercourse with one whose life, as they gaze upward upon it from the lower region in which their own daily lives are spent, they do not feel able to distinguish from that of saints upon whom the Church has set its seal. They would not presume to decide that he reached the same heights with them ; but that both one and the other are so much above what ordinary Christians attain or can venture to estimate, that, like mountain-tops, of which sometimes one peak seems the highest and sometimes another, according to the point of view from which they are observed, they cannot venture to compare them.

For the particulars of Mr. Langdale's "hidden life," as far as they may be known to man, we must refer our readers to Father Gallwey's sermon. We should be at a great disadvantage if we allowed ourselves to describe, after him, the daily life of the great Christian whom he here calls, in some sense, a father to every English Catholic ; not by reason only of his superior acquaintance with it, or of the authority with which his position enables him to speak, nor yet only of his greater acquaintance with the spiritual life, but also because some things might not be suitable to be said by us, which were very suitable when spoken in the place where God dwells on earth, and at the moment when the body was yet lying before the altar, awaiting the last benediction, ready to be laid "on earth's quiet breast," like the precious seed of a future harvest, in expectation of that day for which the City of God is waiting and travailing, and which is to call it forth to a new and glorious life. We cannot imagine that any Catholic can read the marvellously interesting details here given without finding his heart burn within him and his eyes fill with tears ; and while, as a duty which no degree of confidence should ever tempt us to neglect, we offer for him the prayers "which may or may not be needed ; for ourselves, we would offer up a prayer which most certainly is needed ; that we may honour this good father in work as well as in word, and in all patience, that so a blessing may come from him to us, and that the blessing may endure in the latter days."

These few pages profess to give a sketch only of Mr. Langdale's inner life. We most heartily join in the hope expressed, that of his public life "we may soon know more." It could not fail to be curious and interesting, if it were only as a material for history. If, as we have seen, he witnessed great changes, both in the political and social world, and in the outward position of English Catholics, his time was no less marked by great internal changes among them. These last it was that he himself most felt. He attended the great gathering at the Ushaw jubilee ten years ago ; and there, before an assembly, all of whom looked up to him almost as a father, he insisted chiefly on the change of feeling and knowledge among English Catholics since his own youth, when their most prominent men formed themselves into a club, of

which he was himself a member, under the title of "The Cisalpine Club." Nothing was more natural to his humility than thus to refer to that name, only to call attention to what he felt to have been then the imperfection of his own Catholic character. What it really did prove—although of all present he was perhaps the only person who did feel that so it was—was only the greatness of our obligation to himself, as the person who had done more than any other towards raising the tone of the higher Catholic families in England.

One day comes of its own accord to the mind of every man who thinks or hears of the public life of Mr. Langdale—the day when the great county of York was assembled in the Castle-yard, led by all its chiefs of all political parties, for the purpose (although they knew it not) of making a public demonstration against the Kingdom founded on earth by Him "who shall rule all nations with a rod of iron," and to cry out against Him, "We will not have this Man to reign over us." Before great and small, rich and poor, it was that day Mr. Langdale's singular happiness to have, not an opportunity merely, but a positive call of duty to stand out alone, and make a public profession of his faith and hope in "the patronage of the Blessed Mother of God and of His saints." Of all men he was one of the last (as indeed he said at the time) who, amidst such a scene, would have volunteered the introduction of subjects so sacred. But, challenged as he was, all who knew him felt that he would have given his testimony as calmly, as clearly, and with as little hesitation if he had been standing before a heathen emperor; and if, in the great area before him, he had had before his eyes, not the multitude of his deluded but generous countrymen; but the lions, to whose fury it needed but a single word to give him over.

Few men are blessed with an opportunity so great and noble; by none was such an opportunity ever more nobly greeted. But such a moment, which, when we look back upon it, seems to stand by itself in a life, is, in fact, only the sudden manifestation of a habit which has long been silently forming. Such an act is but the flower which, once in long years, attracts the eyes of men, but which would never have opened itself if it had not derived its life from the root, which has long been extending itself unseen, and deep beneath the earth.

Father Gallwey speaks of "those who saw him in his place in Parliament, winning by his fearless honesty respect for a cause abhorred by popular prejudice." One such instance we remember, which specially excited the admiration of Protestants. Mr. Langdale was, as is known to all who ever conversed with him on the subject, a strong politician. He was chosen by ballot in 1840, as a member of the Hull Election Committee. Party feeling ran very high, and it chanced that the majority of the Committee were men of his own party, a Yorkshire baronet, Sir George Caley, being the Chairman. The Committee divided, if we remember right, fifty-six times, and in fifty-five of those divisions Mr. Langdale voted directly against his own party. This was felt by the strongest Protestants to have been an act as remarkable for courage as for honesty.

It is impossible not to feel, that in giving to the Catholics of England such a leader at such a period of their history; in calling his Christian character

out of the shade in which his singular humility would gladly have concealed it, and directing to it the eyes of all men ; and in sparing him to us so many years, it must have been the will of the great Head of the Church, the Ruler of all nations, to force upon our notice an example which would always have been most valuable, but which is at this moment especially necessary. Catholics are already far more numerous in the higher classes than they have been for many generations ; and, if we may augur anything from present appearances, the Catholic faith is on the point of spreading among the English aristocracy in a manner quite without precedent. At such a moment it has pleased God to direct the attention of all men to Mr. Langdale, as a sample of what an English Catholic gentleman or nobleman should be, and of what Divine Grace can make him. As conversions are multiplied, and as young men are growing up whose parents were converted before they were old enough to choose for themselves between truth and falsehood, we shall assuredly, in too many instances, be reminded, that a man does not finally triumph over the devil and the flesh, perhaps still less over the world, by making the first great sacrifice of acknowledging himself a Catholic, and submitting, at all costs, to the successor of S. Peter. It is a great grace, and he who responds to it will receive greater graces still. But assuredly he will need more than others to bear in mind the solemn warning of Holy Scripture—"When thou comest to the service of God prepare thy soul for temptation. For gold is tried in the fire, and acceptable men in the furnace of humiliation."

Now as ever before it is not he that begins well, but "he that shall persevere to the end," that shall be saved. "To him that overcometh I will give to sit down with Me on My throne, as I also have overcome, and am set down with My Father on His throne." The Catholics of England, we doubt not, are heartily praying that the young men who are coming on to take the places on earth of those who have won their crowns, may, like them, persevere to the end. There are among them the sons of one much and justly honoured and lamented—Henry, seventeenth Duke of Norfolk—whom we all remember to have seen, in years past, attending upon Mr. Langdale, "as a son with a father," ready, (as we then confidently hoped,) to take his place when he should be called to his rest. But it did not so please God. He went before the man whom we hoped he would follow. What better can we ask for his sons, than that, when their time comes, they may leave behind them a record like his, before God and among men ? Or what means can more tend to that end, than that they should begin life under the shadow of the blessed example, and not less blessed end, of Charles Langdale ?

---

*The Life of Father de Ravignan, of the Society of Jesus.* By Father de PONLEVOY, of the same Society. Translated at S. Beunos College, North Wales. Dublin : Kelly, 1869.

WE need not tell the readers of the DUBLIN REVIEW, that this is one of the most interesting lives published of late years. The life of such a man as Ravignan, by one who shared all his counsels and his daily life, could not be otherwise. That this is in all respects a worthy translation,—the inscription in the title-page which connects it with the chief seat of theological studies in the English province of that great Society to which both the author and the subject belong, would suffice to warrant. And we have to thank the translator for putting before those who cannot quite familiarly read French, this faithful and life-like portrait of the great Jesuit. We must not trust ourselves to begin to extract anything from a volume so full of deep interest. Father Ravignan was born at Bayonne Dec. 1, 1795, on the feast of S. Francis Xavier, whose name he received. In 1813 he began his studies for the bar of Paris. When Napoleon returned from Elba, he volunteered into the royal army, escaped through great dangers into Spain, and returned after Waterloo. When peace was restored, he returned to the career of the magistracy, one much more distinct in France than among us. In 1822 he devoted himself to the Church, and in the November of the same year joined the Society of Jesus. His services in the Society are the subject of this volume. It is worth noticing that twice at different periods of his life, when his health, always very weak, had quite given way, he was unexpectedly restored, one of his penitents having offered to Almighty God her own life instead of his. Both times the offer was accepted. He died Feb. 25, 1858. We hope in an early number to make his very remarkable career the subject of an article.

---

*The Silence of Christian Transfigurations.* By Rev. T. HARPER, S.J.

*Religion Judged by the World.* By Rev. H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J.

*Convent Life over England in the 19th Century.* By Father GALLWEY, S.J.  
London : Burns, Oates, & Co. .

MANY different things may be called in different respects the foundation of Catholicity. Its scientific foundation is a sound philosophy ; its argumentative foundation the evidences of credibility ; its ecclesiastical foundation the dogma of infallibility ; its theological foundation the dogma of God's existence and attributes. In like manner, we should be disposed to say that its ethical foundation is the ascetical principle. We do not wish to dogmatize unwarrantably. But consider any non-Catholic who heartily embraces those various truths, which are contained in the proposition, that counsels of perfection point to a far more admirable kind of life than that led by ordinary men. We are always disposed to regard such a non-Catholic as being on his

road towards the Church, in quite a different sense from that in which others can be so accounted. The importance therefore is to our mind extremely great, of doing fearless battle against Protestant prejudice on this head ; and of exhibiting, by every available argument, the nobleness of the religious life.

We are most grateful then to the Jesuit Fathers, for taking occasion by the recent convent case, to preach and publish a course of sermons on this theme. Miss Saurin's suit has brought into prominent exhibition the well-known fact, how profound is the hatred felt by Englishmen in general, for convents, and for the idea which they represent. If then, as F. Gallwey tersely puts it, "convents are irreconcilable with the present mind of England, this island needs a re-conversion to Christianity" (p. 8).<sup>\*</sup> This in fact, and nothing less, is what Englishmen have to learn : viz. the fundamental falsehood and odiousness of any standard of virtue, except the Catholic and ascetical ; except the standard, which regards every man as more excellent, precisely in proportion as he lives a life of closer union with God.

Our comments on the individual sermons must be very brief. They are admirable one and all ; but they are of that class, which cannot be reviewed, except either very briefly indeed, or else in very great detail. F. Harper's indeed is but very partially concerned with the subject : still it is dedicated to the Sisters of Mercy ; and contains a very beautiful application (p. 15) of our Blessed Lord's hidden life, to illustrate "the dull uniformity of routine, exact division of the day, devotion to menial occupations," which are regarded by the blinded, and ignorant Protestant, as the chief characteristics of life in a convent. From F. Coleridge's very striking sermon, we will select two passages, as expressing a doctrine of which it is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance.

"Our actions, our words, our thoughts, are not measured and valued by God according to their substance, or their results, or their fruits, but simply according to the intention which animates them and rules them. Thus, as St. Paul teaches, we may give all our goods to feed the poor, we may even give our bodies to be burned, and yet it may profit us nothing. We may dispose of a whole fortune in alms-deeds and works of seeming devotion, from a motive, for instance, of vain glory ; we may lay down our lives for some cause or principle inconsistent with charity, the true love of God, and all may be wasted or worse than wasted in the balance of His judgment. And, on the other hand, a simple and holy soul may thread a needle, or scour a floor, or dust a room, or darn a stocking, and the purity and intensity of the love of God for which she does these things, may make her actions meritorious even of the highest crowns in heaven."

"All Christian perfection, whether it be that of Religious persons or not, consists in little things : in minute exactness ; in strict purity of intention ; in great vigilance over the thoughts, the affections, and the movements of the heart ; in careful obedience ; in perpetual self-sacrifice ; in the utmost fidelity to the daily duties of our state of life, whatever that state may be ; in child-like docility to the will of God concerning us, in whatever way He may make it manifest to us."

---

<sup>\*</sup> We wish we could share F. Gallwey's doubt, whether convents *are* thus detested by the great mass of Englishmen.



By way of variety, we will extract from F. Gallwey two amusing hits at two great English institutions.

"After three hundred years of experience, we do not expect much mercy from the British jury : and though we are quite aware that a jury is a great power—a kind of many-headed deity, before which, during their little hour of authority, the most learned and the most eloquent have to offer much incense, yet we never for a moment imagine, &c., &c.

"If you saw the man who sits penning the declamation that is to become law among the great English nation ; if you could know who his father was and who his mother, and how much he is paid for his writing ; if you could converse with him and see him and handle him ; possibly you would not follow his opinion on any point of importance : but because he is unseen he is a Deity. From behind the shelter of his incognito, he spreads havoc through the land. He pours a poison into the mind of the people—for a falsehood is a poison. And there is always a multitude ready to drink in such a poison : for they have not time or leisure or inclination to pursue truth, and this falsehood they can have for a penny."

---

*Holy Confidence or Simplicity with God.* Translated from F. Rogacci's "Unum Necessarium." London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

THIS is a charming little volume, and will doubtless stimulate many to seek acquaintance with the whole work from which it is extracted. As its title denotes, it is primarily ascetic ; but several dogmatic questions of ascetical bearing are incidentally discussed. The "holy confidence" spoken of is considered by F. Rogacci the appropriate state of mind, for "every one who is free from mortal sin ; who carefully tries to avoid venial faults, to purify his affections, to acquire the virtues that he needs, fully convinced that he is as nothing before God, and can do nothing without His help" (p. 14). Those, on the other hand, are not included in the author's subject, "who have but a slight knowledge of God, who think too much of themselves, and have an inordinate attachment to the good things of this world." As to the former class, however, he holds that they will best please God "by a sweet and confiding liberty" (p. 5). They "can pass whole days with Him with inexpressible delight," and find "the time of prayer a time of joy" (p. 12).

Among the dogmatic matter incidentally introduced, is (p. 61) a consideration of attrition and contrition. F. Rogacci considers—and we heartily agree with him—that some writers enormously exaggerate the difference of *difficulty* between these two respective acts.\* He even ventures on the

---

\* May not the phrase however be misunderstood, that "*the smallest degree* of true love" suffices for contrition ? The author means, of course, of "*amor super omnia*," of "*sovereign love*." But would he naturally be so understood ?

remark, which to us certainly does not appear one whit too strong, that "every man who has made some progress in the knowledge and love of God, is contrite *whenever he chooses to be so*" (p. 60); i.e., whenever he turns his intellect to the appropriate thoughts. Were an act of contrition so rare as some have supposed, what hope would there be for material "heretics who are in good faith, the number of whom, perhaps, is far greater than we imagine" (p. 61)? There is a different question altogether, of course, and one external to the author's theme; viz., whether even attrition is at all easily elicited, by those who are just beginning to rise from reckless habits of sin and worldliness.\*

Another dogmatic question treated is man's certainty of justification. The author does not hesitate to say (p. 73) "that really pious people can be *quite certain* of God's friendship;" though, of course, not with metaphysical certainty, still less with the certainty of faith. He shows that such an opinion is widely removed from the Protestant heresy condemned at Trent.

F. Rogacci inquires also (p. 111), whether "it is true that the number of the elect is small;" and devotes twenty-five pages to the inquiry. He thinks it "probable that his opponents will find a larger company in heaven than they think" (p. 126). At the same time he draws a distinction (*ib.*) which seems to us of great moment. Even if the elect were comparatively very few, it would not at all follow that salvation is overwhelmingly difficult; for if there be one phenomenon more obvious on the surface than another, it is the persistency with which many Christians abstain from doing what they might *most easily* do to please God. For ourselves, while admitting thoroughly of course that nothing whatever can be certainly known on the matter, we fondly cherish a hope that God will show signal mercy at the last—in the way, e.g., of infusing contrition—on great multitudes: especially on those who have been under grievous spiritual disadvantage; on heathens, e.g., among whom the Gospel has never been preached.

The one pervading moral of the whole work, is the unapproachable efficacy of *prayer*; and the happy confidence which should be entertained by all those, who are habitually given to practising prayer under due conditions.

---

*Vita Vitæ nostræ meditantibus proposita.* Curante HENRICO JACOBO COLERIDGE, Societatis Jesu. Londini: Burns et Oates.

WE think that few greater benefits could be bestowed at this day on Catholic literature, than a carefully written life of our Blessed Lord; a work which, while remaining entirely faithful to long-established and certain Catholic principles, should also incorporate the many highly important results, which have been secured by that higher and more discerning criticism so characteristic of the present time. F. Coleridge mentions in his Preface,

---

\* Is not the word "wish" in p. 59 a mistranslation? It would naturally be understood to signify, we think, a velleity, rather than a firm and efficacious resolve.

that for a long time past his principal wish has been to put together such a work ; nor do we believe there is any other Catholic in these islands so well fitted for its due execution. We may be allowed perhaps without any breach of literary etiquette, as so many years have elapsed, to mention an article of his which appeared in our number for October, 1864, on " Outlines of Gospel History," as exhibiting his singular qualifications for his self-imposed task. And we have read with great pleasure his emphatic statement (p. x.), that nothing except the Church's definition would ever lead him to admit the existence of any error in the Gospels, however small. If the Church indeed did put forth any definition on the matter, there can be little doubt she would determine in favour of F. Coleridge's doctrine and not against it.

At the same time we must admit, that for two different reasons we cannot entirely sympathize with this publication ; which is in effect neither more nor less, than a harmony of the four Gospels. In the first place, it appears to us an inconvenient course, that a harmony should be published, before the author has had an opportunity of explaining the ground on which he prefers this or that arrangement of facts. We think that his dissertations should precede his harmony, and not the reverse. In fact, from pursuing the latter course, F. Coleridge has been obliged in some few places, (as he confesses in p. viii.), to adopt a different arrangement in this volume from that which he accounts the more probable ; because, without the necessary commentaries, this latter would not be sufficiently intelligible to his readers.

Then, secondly, we much doubt whether " The life of our Life " is best " proposed to those who meditate " in the shape of a harmony. It seems to us, on one hand, that the true chronological arrangement of events is generally quite irrelevant to purposes of meditation. And it seems to us on the other hand, that, where more than one Evangelist records the same event with different circumstances, the prominent exhibition of this difference—such as a harmony must present—would tend rather to distract than to concentrate the attention.

We offer these remarks with much diffidence. But for one reason, at all events, we are heartily glad to see this volume ; viz. because its appearance would seem to convey some earnest and pledge of F. Coleridge's seriously applying himself to the completion of his undertaking as a whole.

*The Preaching of the Cross.* A Brief Discourse, by Rev. C. B. GARSIDE, M.A. : introductory to the singing of Sacred Music on the Passion. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

THIS address will be read with extreme interest by all, who intelligently enjoy sacred music, and find in it that singular spiritual profit which it is calculated to produce. Mr. Garside quotes F. Newman's memorable burst of eloquence on musical sounds (p. 6) : " They have escaped from some higher sphere ; they are the outpourings of eternal harmony in the mediums of created sound ; they are echoes from our Home ; the voice of

angels ; the Magnificat of Saints." And he proceeds to ask, whether the one legitimate—or even the *most* legitimate—application of this divinely-given utterance be really *the opera*. It may surely be called the dictate of common sense, that nothing but eternal truth affords adequate scope for this most heavenly gift. Mr. Garside writes with that heartiness of genuine feeling and conviction, which generates real eloquence ; and his little discourse is, in its way, quite a gem.

---

*Church Music and Church Choirs.* Two Papers reprinted from the DUBLIN REVIEW. London : Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE must not express any eulogy on these papers, as they so recently appeared in our pages. But we have reason to know that this publication, in a separate form, has been eagerly desired by a large class of readers.

---

*The Month* for February, 1869. London : Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.

IT has always been our wish, in the DUBLIN REVIEW, on the one hand to protest earnestly against every tenet condemned by the Church, whether advocated by non-Catholics or by *unsound* Catholics ; and on the other hand to labour, as best we can, in promoting harmony and smoothing differences between the Church's loyal children. We profoundly deprecate therefore any misunderstanding, between a periodical of such principles as the "Month" and ourselves. We think most of our readers will have been of opinion, that we cordially expressed this feeling in our January notice of our contemporary (p. 227) ; and we are certainly somewhat surprised by the tone in which he has replied. We will confine ourselves however strictly, to the explanatory and defensive. When our meaning has been sufficiently understood, it will be manifest how very slight is the difference between the "Month" and the DUBLIN REVIEW.

We are particularly desirous to rectify one misapprehension, both because it is rather a serious one, and also because we have partly ourselves to thank for it. In October 1868, we said (p. 548) that those "deducible" and "protective" truths, which the Church from time to time infallibly declares, "were generally unknown to the Church of the Apostles." The "Month" misunderstood this word "generally." In January, consequently, we had to explain what we had meant by it ; viz., that *most* of those truths were altogether unknown to the Church of the Apostles. Our attention however being fixed on this word "generally" and on its misapprehension, we carelessly twice committed the clerical error, of writing "the Apostles" instead of "the Church of the Apostles" ; nor did we observe

this error, till we read the "Month" article of February. If our readers however will look at our October sentence, they will see that we could not possibly have had any other meaning in January than that which we now express. The question throughout concerns, not the Apostles, but *the Church of the Apostles* ; not what the Apostles *knew*, but what they *taught*. Their personal infused knowledge is a matter absolutely external to the whole argument : and we shall say no more about it, except to express our hearty agreement with that section of Suarez which the "Month" cites ; and to add, in regard to the extent of Apostolic knowledge, that we are fully disposed to accept the highest view which any approved theologian has ever laid down as probable.

These "deducible" and "protective" truths are such as the following :—  
 (1) That Jansenius's book contains five certain propositions according to its legitimate objective sense ; that Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, taught the respective heresies which go by their name ; and other such dogmatical facts. (2) That the words "Consubstantial," "Transubstantiation," &c., &c., truly and aptly express the respective dogmata to which the Church applies them. (3) That S. Francis of Assisi, S. Alphonsus, or any other given person canonized by the Church, is truly a Saint. (4) That the rational soul is essentially the "form" of the human body ; and that any other given philosophical proposition is true, which the Church may have defined. (5) That the civil liberty of worship and of publishing books is not in itself an institution, either required by justice or salutary for society. (6) That the Pontiff's civil principedom is, under the circumstances of modern times, morally necessary for the Church's welfare.

We need not continue the catalogue of such truths. We still think it would be the natural and correct mode of speaking, to say that "most of them are truths altogether unknown to the Church of the Apostles." The "Month" differs from us here, and we have really no wish whatever to contest the point. But whichever of the two is right, we cannot see that the question is other than most purely verbal.\*

This particular point however was only raised in February. What were our statements then in January ? The "Month" of last August had said, that "the Church does not assume, and never has assumed, any power to discern and proclaim truths altogether unknown to the Church of the Apostles." In January we expressed two opinions *à propos* of this sentence. Firstly, we characterized as "most unsound and mischievous" the doctrine, that the Church has no power of infallibly declaring "deducible" and "protective" truths. Secondly, we implied that the sentence, which we have just quoted from the "Month" of August, had been "inaccurate" and "unguarded" : and this, because, whether taken with or without the context, it would be understood "in its obvious and grammatical sense"—that is, apart from the "Month's" known character—as expressing that unsound doctrine

---

\* The "Month," we should explain, seems not indisposed to admit that those *dogmatical facts*, which have been infallibly determined in later ages, were "altogether unknown to the Church of the Apostles" : but it adds, that these *are* "facts," and not "truths."

just mentioned : a doctrine however, which the "Month" of November had emphatically disavowed, and with which (as we proceeded to say in January) its Editor "has of course no kind of sympathy."\* These were the two opinions which we expressed or implied in January. On the former, which is no doubt of extreme importance, there is happily no controversy whatever between the "Month" and ourselves. The sole point of difference then is, that we regard the original sentence as having been open to legitimate misconception ; while the "Month" considers that the context would have reasonably made all misconception impossible. It is certainly not worth while to say another word on such a matter. Transeat. Let us grant for argument's sake—or rather for the sake of *avoiding* argument—that we were mistaken.

We had thought, as we said in January, that our contemporary's "words" of August "would have been widely considered as a pointed declaration, on what he himself accounts the unorthodox side." The possibility of such misconception had been however brought to an end, by his reply in November. We had been only anxious to *prevent* such misconception ; and our object was accomplished.

There is one omission in our January notice, which has been pointed out to us since its publication. The expression, "truths altogether unknown to the Church of the Apostles," originated with Mr. Liddon ; it was accepted by the "Month" (so to speak) *ad hominem*, and not as the mode of expression which the "Month" would of itself have chosen. According to our own sincere view of the case, the context in general, and particularly the adoption of Mr. Liddon's own words, rendered the sentence even *more* liable to misconception than it would otherwise have been. But, as the "Month" thinks otherwise, we regret that the thought did not occur to us, of mentioning the fact to which our attention has now been drawn.

We must not conclude without explaining two sentences—entirely unconnected with this little controversy—which the "Month," in a note, has cited for reprehension from Dr. Ward's writings. In both cases there is misconception of Dr. Ward's meaning ; in the former, very important misconception. Dr. Ward is apparently understood in the "Month" as having maintained, that our Blessed Lord's human perfections—His human love of God and man, His human wisdom, His human compassionateness, &c. &c.—are not personal perfections of God the Son. Such an opinion, we suppose, could not be characterized less severely than as *heretical* : at all events, it was never Dr. Ward's. The very sentence, quoted in the "Month," speaks of some previous explanation having been given, as to the sense in which the words were used ; and we wish his critic had referred to that explanation. The same explanation is given still more clearly in the concluding pamphlet of that controversy, in the course of which the sentence occurred. See "Correspondence between Rev. F. Roberts and Dr. Ward," pp. 17, 29. We will quote one sentence from the latter page. "If by 'personal perfection' be

---

\* We say confidently that this was our meaning, because we have the clearest memory of what we intended to say. We do not ourselves even now see how our words can bear any other sense : but this is of course matter of opinion, and we have no wish to argue it.



meant 'a perfection appertaining to the person,' *most incontestably* the perfections of the sacred humanity are personal perfections of our Blessed Lord." And Dr. Ward proceeds to say, that he had avowedly used the phrase "personal perfection" in a sense "altogether different." It would occupy some space to set forth what Dr. Ward did mean ; and we refer therefore any one who may care about the matter, to the above-mentioned pages of the "Correspondence."

The "Month" cites secondly a sentence, taken from our January notice of Mr. Lloyd's work on Free Will (p. 220). We had said that "the Catholic who tries to live in the presence of God, is very frequently indeed during the day . . . labouring to fix his thoughts on God, against the opposite solicitations of surrounding objects and interests." Now Mr. Lloyd, who is apparently not a Christian, holds (p. 28) that "effort" in the direction of good "is *nothing else* than *freely endured pain*." We replied, that "of course there are particular seasons, of violent temptation e. g. to mortal sin ; or again of aridity and the like in the case of the more saintly ; which would not only bear out Mr. Lloyd's description, but a great deal more." "But as a general rule," we added—and this is the sentence to which the "Month" objects—"the interior Christian's effort at fixing his thoughts on God is accompanied by predominant sweetness and great sensible devotion." We did not speak therefore concerning periods of temptation to mortal sin, or again of aridity ; nor further did we speak — as is plain from the context—concerning times of meditation. We spoke concerning those frequent intervals through the day, when an interior Christian turns his thoughts by an effort from the dust of this world, to one or other spiritual and heavenly thought. Certainly the writer of the notice had no right to speak of such matters from his own experience ; but (if he rightly remembers) he had learned this lesson from the late F. Faber, to whom he always looked up as a great authority on such matters. If we spoke incorrectly, we regret it ; but we are still under the impression that our statement is perfectly accurate. We may add, that it seems to us peculiarly in harmony with the general spirit of F. Rogacci's treatise on "Holy Confidence," to which we have devoted a previous notice.

Turning to a totally different subject, we heartily thank the "Month" for inserting in this number a translation of Card. Caterini's letter on the Pope's civil principedom. We referred to this letter in January (p. 225) as to one of much importance ; and we hope our readers will carefully study it.

---

*The Union Review* for March, 1869. London : Hayes.

WE notice this number chiefly for the purpose of saying, how much we regret to find the new editor imitating his predecessor, in what has been, from the first, among the worst features of the "Union Review": the indulgence of mere invective against opponents, without even the attempt at any argumentative corroboration. Nothing e. g. could be more legitimate,

than that the periodical before us should argue for Mr. Renouf against F. Bottalla, and for Mr. Ffoulkes against ourselves : in fact, it is precisely to non-Catholics that one naturally looks for a defence of such writers. But what purpose is served, by merely calling F. Bottalla's singularly complete and able pamphlet "a *feeble* excuse for the *heretic* Pope Honorius" (p. 184), without mentioning any one instance of such "feebleness" ? As to our own January criticisms of Mr. Ffoulkes, the chief comment made on them is, that we "wallowed foaming" while we wrote them—whatever that may mean.

There is however one intelligible statement put forth, concerning our dealing with Mr. Ffoulkes. For it is implied that in earlier days, when that gentleman "was held up as an example for all Anglicans to follow," our estimate of his ability was very different from that which we now express. Now in the first place we have, of course, never denied, that many excellent Catholics—one of them is the writer of an admirable article on "a recent scandal" in the March number of the "Month"—think more highly of Mr. Ffoulkes's intellectual power than we do. Nor, in the second place, do we deny that our own estimate of it is a little changed ; that as one after another of his works has appeared, we have come to think more meanly of his abilities even than we did at first. But we challenge our critic to mention any passage in this REVIEW, since the present editor has been responsible for its contents, which implies any opinion that Mr. Ffoulkes is on a level in point of ability with "the average of ordinary educated men."

The "Union Review" further says (p. 191), that there has recently been published "an exposure of definite heresy on the human nature of Christ, asserted *in a very likely quarter*, the DUBLIN REVIEW." We have only two objections to make against this statement ; but they may perhaps be accounted sufficient. Firstly, as we have pointed out in our preceding notice, the sentence referred to contains no "heresy" whatever—"definite" or indefinite—"on the human nature of Christ." Secondly, whatever things that sentence may have contained, it never appeared in the DUBLIN REVIEW at all.

---

*L'Enfant.* Par Mgr. L'ÉVÊQUE D'ORLÉANS, de l'Académie Française. Paris : Charles Douniol, Libraire-Éditeur, Rue de Cournon, 29. 1869.

THERE is no more characteristic mark of the heart of a true priest than the love of little children—the love and the reverence due (as Mgr. Dupanloup has admirably shown) to that holy state of infancy which our Divine Lord cradled in His arms, and then set in the midst of His disciples to be their model and His own representative. There is nothing so like a mother's heart as the heart of a priest. Nay, in the words of one whose own was loving in proportion to its strength,\* *it is tenderer than a mother's.*

---

\* "Plus tendre qu'une mère."—PÈRE LACORDAIRE.

"She may forget," says the Great High Priest, "yet will not I forget;" and of His love, in its more than feminine tenderness, and more than human patience, He has given to His true priests to partake, each in his own measure and degree. Two more vigorous intellects and more masculine characters can scarcely be named among all who have wrestled with the powers of evil in our stormy days than Père Lacordaire and Mgr. Dupanloup. But in our eyes the great Dominican was never greater than in the short calm autumn evening of his glorious life, when he made himself once more a child among his boys at Sorèze; and they who shall hereafter read (we hope after the lapse of many a long year) the records of the noble career of the Bishop of Orleans, will perhaps linger with deepest interest upon the five-and-twenty years spent in his labour of love at the *Petit Séminaire*. The little book now before us gives the result of the experience gained in those years. It is an invaluable gift to parents, teachers, and, we may add, even to confessors and legislators, to all, in fact, whose office bears, directly or remotely, on the momentous work of education. We give the following extract from the chapter on the *religious reverence due to the dignity of childhood*, which lays down the great principle held by the author to be the essential foundation of education.

Had we space to do so, we should gladly extract many striking and instructive directions on the carrying this great principle into practice, and on the special remedies to be applied to special defects, which occupy many pages full of spiritual and moral teaching, adapted not only to the training of children, but to the reformation and sanctification of our own hearts.

"*Let us make man after our own image and likeness.* God is boundless life, boundless intelligence, boundless love; God is supreme truth, beauty, and goodness. Now it has pleased Him that these constituent perfections of His own Essence should also form the foundation of being in this little child. God has willed that the highest powers of His Divine Nature should be reflected in the budding faculties of this frail being.

"This little child then lives, thinks, loves, as God loves, thinks, and lives. Truth, beauty, and goodness must be the essential and only object of intellectual and moral teaching in his education; and in the perfect accordance of the great human faculties with the true, the beautiful, and the good, with Supreme truth, beauty, and goodness, will be found the principle of the harmony, the repose, the plenitude, and the power of these faculties. This and no other is the work of education. . . . This sublime theory of the faculties of man is the principal foundation of the theory of education; it pervades the development and exercise of the human faculties. It alone reveals their play, their nature, and their action, no less in the grown man than in the child; at the same time it is the only light of the sciences, the languages, the literature, the poetry, and the arts, which he learns. In all these things God appears in the first place; His name, His glory, shine forth on every side, and cast a divine light upon all the beauty of human nature, on all the rich gifts with which God has endowed it. The divine perfection, after the image of which that child was created, is then the end, the form, the image, the essential type of the education which he ought to receive: 'Let us make man after our image and likeness;' no words can be more explicit. Thus God becomes to that child at once the perfection of his being, the immortal nourishment of his intelligence, the inspiration of his love, and the life of his whole soul.

"It will now be understood why I have said that education is a divine

work, why I have said that the reverence due to the dignity of that child is a religious reverence, which ought to rise even to God himself. But it ought also to be understood, that this beautiful and noble nature, that all these gifts of the Creator, have to germinate and grow, and that they crave the development and the culture of this religious reverence.

“Life, intelligence, and love, mind, talent, genius, good sense, good taste, will, character and conscience, literature, science, art, industry itself, religion, morality, truth, virtue, all these great and divine gifts of humanity are yet dark and nameless in a child, and they will remain buried in the depths of his nature, unless we take care to study them reverently and cultivate them religiously. This is the noble work of education ; but once more, a reverential education can alone satisfy these high exigencies, and correspond to these sublime instincts. A devotion and reverence, truly and sincerely religious, can alone duly cultivate the admirable gifts of the Creator Himself, can alone elevate these glorious faculties to the power of their natural integrity, establish them in the might and plenitude of their action, give them their fullest increase, and crown them with the flowers and fruits of knowledge and virtue ; and therefore, education, as it appears to me, is nothing else but the deepest and fullest expression of the reverence due to human nature.

“This theory, exalted as it may appear, is the very foundation upon which the whole edifice of education rests, and upon which it must be raised. . . . Whenever we fail to devote ourselves religiously to cultivate and bring out in the child the nature and dignity of his being ; whenever we neglect to form within him the man, as created by God, as formed and finished by God, whenever we fail to do this, we betray our trust and violate the reverence which is due to that child and to his original greatness. I am compelled to add that this miserable mistake is of no rare occurrence. The teachers of youth must never then forget that *the child is the man*, the depositary of all the gifts of God, and of all the hopes of humanity ; that, young as he is, he is already invested with all the grace and all the dignity which God has communicated to human nature.

“This remembrance will suffice to sustain their courage and to save them from ever sinking under the noble and laborious task to which they have devoted themselves.

“Assuredly, when the Creator Himself was pleased to make man, He did not perform that great work negligently or contemptuously ; it was no mere pastime to Him, like the creation of the material world.

“It is remarkable that in the creation of man, He laid aside that brief and imperious *fiat* by which He had brought forth from the eternally barren womb of nothingness the multitude of material creatures which delight our eyes, including even the light and the sun. He seems, as it were, to recollect Himself ; then He uttered a word of counsel, a word (if I may so speak) of reverence,—those great and immortal words, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness,’ and then He acted with a gravity befitting so solemn a work. The creation of man was then in the first place the result of Supreme deliberation ; next, an action wholly divine ; and, lastly, a breath, an inspiration of eternal life (*spiraculum vitæ*). Such was the greatness of the creation of man ; such in its gravity and its greatness ought to be the work of his education. It is essential fully to understand this before we set our hand to it.”

---

*A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M.A.* By the Right Honourable Sir JOHN TAYLOR COLERIDGE, D.C.L. Parker, Oxford and London.

JOHN KEBLE died March 29, 1866, wanting less than a month of seventy-four years. We doubt whether any other distinguished man on record, after living to such an age, has had a memoir of his life published by one who, born two years before himself, had been his most valued and intimate friend since the two were just passing together out of boyhood. This is the good fortune of his friends and admirers. It was the singular good fortune of Keble himself to keep through a long life, not only the cordial love, but the correspondence, and, to a very considerable degree, the society of the friends he made at college, to which he went before he was fifteen. Few, indeed, at any period, have that happiness,—still fewer, in our days; when so many, one here and one there, while delighting themselves to the utmost in the affection and intercourse of those with whom by years of closest intercourse they have grown to be but as one soul, have heard the voice of Him who said to the Father of the Faithful, “Go forth out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father’s house, and come unto a land which I shall show thee.” He alone knows how many of these have felt their inward affection even greater and warmer towards those who have felt it their duty, not only to remain behind, when they themselves “arose and went,” but to break off from their society and intercourse.

There are among us many Catholics to whom the volume before us will be full of tender and painful interest in this very way, as giving them a glimpse into the inner life of friends most dear to them, and from whom they have long been severed. But it needs no such personal feeling to make it most deeply interesting. As a poet, Keble stands entirely by himself in the rich roll of England’s distinguished sons. He is, and we can hardly doubt that he must ever be, emphatically the sacred poet of the language. Such, at least, is the judgment of the present writer. As a writer of hymns, indeed, Father Faber so much surpasses him as to leave no room for comparison. But sacred poetry, as distinct from hymns, was his especial gift, and in it there is no English writer who can be compared with him. That this should be the feeling of those who belong to his own school, or who were brought up in it in their younger days, is so natural as not to prove that those who come after us will share it. But there could hardly be a school more remote from his own, than that represented by the Dean of Westminster and the *Spectator* newspaper. Yet both of these wrote in the same tone of hearty admiration of the poet. As to readers at large, probably no volume of poetry ever had such a sale. More than two hundred thousand copies, we believe, went off in the author’s life, and Sir J. T. Coleridge says that eleven thousand more were sold in the nine months following his death. Besides all this, it is believed the copies printed in the United States have been at least as numerous. In looking forward to future times one cannot help regretting that poems marked for immortality should be so closely linked with a religious system essentially ephemeral. For come what may in the future,

it is at least most clear that Keble's special development of the Anglican system can hardly very long survive himself. Happily, however, very many of his poems express, not his own peculiar system, but those truths which were entwined in it, and which will live on in the Catholic Church until the world comes to an end ; and we cannot doubt that those poems, at least, will endure as long as the English language itself.

We have always thought that there was something specially providential in the fact that the "Christian Year" was published exactly when it was. It was Keble's strong desire to keep it unpublished till after his death. No one who knew his extreme modesty and almost morbid shrinking from letting in the eyes of others upon his inner feelings, but was astonished he had ever brought himself to overcome that wish. As he himself asks,—

"Why then should gentle hearts and true  
Bare to the waste world's withering view  
Their treasures of delight?"

It is highly characteristic that the circumstance by which he was at last induced to overcome it should have been (as Sir J. T. Coleridge tells us) his father's desire to see it published before his own death. But there were reasons, if they could have been foreseen, which made it most important that not a day should be lost. The work appeared in June, 1827. At that moment the self-styled "Evangelical school" was at its zenith in the Established Church. Towards all other schools of opinion it was, in the plenitude of its self-conceit, rather lofty and patronizing than jealous. It had a condescending sort of pleasure in seeing Christian sentiments in men not supposed to belong to itself, akin to that with which a genially minded Christian sees glimpses of spiritual and moral good in the writings of a good heathen. In this spirit a volume of religious poetry published by a rising Oxford man, not supposed to be evangelical, was received with real pleasure. There was not a family of that school in all England to which it was not immediately welcomed. The younger members of these families drank of those pure fountains with intense delight, and with a thirst that could not be slaked. Within the next six years, hundreds of thousands of them had not merely learned many truths of which they were never likely to have heard in any other way, but had come to love them with their whole hearts. Six years later appeared the "Tracts for the Times" and Newman's sermons. After that, a volume of poetry from any member of the Oxford school would have been shut out of thousands of families, in which almost every line of the "Christian Year" had for several years been familiar as household words. How many took, under Keble's guidance, the first step which in the end led them into the one Church, will never be known in this world. Nor, again, how many who have not yet followed the light so far as that, were prepared by him to follow the Oxford movement as soon as it began. And their children, if not themselves, may yet, by God's grace, follow it to the end. This preparing the way for the after progress of the movement of 1833 was, beyond a doubt, the great work of the "Christian Year," and very effectively that work was done.

Of Keble as a theologian we have no room to say anything. No Catholic certainly can read Sir John Taylor Coleridge's volume without yearning over



a soul which seemed to human eye not only so pure and humble but so much longing for the truth, and yet which passed through life without finding it. It is, of course, difficult at least not to form theories in order to account for this ; but the danger of rash judgment may well deter any man from venturing to propose them to others. He seems to have persuaded himself that a man ought to have attained a higher degree of holiness than he, before he presumed to decide that the "Church of Andrewes and Laud" was indeed no Church. And he says, "nothing could justify one's quitting one's communion except a strong, deliberate, unwilling conviction found in one's heart and conscience, as well as intellect, that it has incurably fallen from being a Church." Practically he seems to have held what we remember seeing quoted from him, "the Church of England is good enough for such a fellow as me." He feared, we think, that if he gave himself to the study, intellectual doubts would arise in his mind whether he would or not, but that intellectual doubts could not justify his leaving the communion in which he found himself placed by God's providence, and therefore he declined reading either Dr. Newman's volume, written while in the act of transition, or an answer to it, published soon after by Dr. Moberly. Nothing probably could have been a much stronger testimony against a system than that such a man, feeling himself, so to say, unworthy to leave it, should have felt so little convinced of its intellectual basis as to have resolved not to look into it.

We are sorry to be compelled to add that he, at times, spoke of the Catholic Church, and especially of persons converted to it, in language which, coming from him, is really astounding. In justice to him, however, it should be remembered that this memoir is published by a man very much more Protestant than himself, who tells us that he induced Keble to suppress, very sorely against his will, one of his most beautiful poems, on account of the terms in which it spoke of our Blessed Lady. He would of course feel it his duty to publish all the strong things against the Catholic Church which Keble might at any time have been betrayed into, and to leave out all the strongest things in the other direction. And thus the effect produced is likely to be really, though we are sure not intentionally, unfair.

*History of the Life and Times of Edward the Third.* By WILLIAM LONGMAN. London : Longmans.

IN Mr. Longman's work, which combines the requisite characteristics of history and biography, to an extent and with an amount of skill rare among the writers of the period, we acknowledge with much gratitude a solid boon to English literature, a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the past, and its illustrious dead. The author's endeavour to make his readers feel personally acquainted with the king, to realize him as a man, to remove him from the category of phantoms to which the far-distant actors in history belong, into the rank of those concerning whom we have distinct views and impres-

sions, is singularly successful. The great soldier, the chivalrous prince, the man of marked character, and resolute, if sometimes erring action, the "splendid veteran," is made to live and move in those pages, no longer indistinctly picturesque, like the figures in ancient tapestry, but clear and individual like the modern photograph. While this book has all the strict and categorical accuracy of detail necessary to its authority as history, it is remarkably free from the fault of dryness. The picturesque, the illustrative elements are never overlooked, or omitted, and the author has gathered from all contemporary quarters materials for the enriching, the adorning, and the completion of his picture. The wars with Scotland and France in which England was involved, the relations of England with the Holy See, the history of trade and of commercial legislation which received so much impetus and development under Edward the Third ; the characteristics and mutations of social manners and customs, are set before the reader with such plainness of statement, and such ease, as few historical writers can boast. Round the central figure of the gallant, knightly king, are grouped the brave and romantic figures of the times, of which Mr. Longman gives a sketch, curiously vivid for its brevity, in a few lines of his preface. "We see Edward," he says, engaged in a mighty war, marching with his hawks and hounds, as if setting forth on some right royal sport ; we see the gallant, cheery general, John of Chandos, singing the songs which he had just learned in Germany, to pass away the time, while the king—sitting in his favourite ship "The Cog Thomas," and dressed in a well-fitting velvet jacket, with a brown hat to match, "which became him well"—waited the onslaught of the Spaniards.

A thorough examination of the serious effect on the political and private life of the nation produced by "The Black Death," and an eloquent exposition of the influence of the institution of chivalry in time of war, are among the most remarkable features of this work, which can hardly be too highly commended for the width of its scope, and the completeness of its finish. Mr. Longman has handled the difficult and complicated subject of the external affairs of England under Edward the Third, as thoroughly and as well as he has treated the domestic history of the period. He gives an account of the condition of all the component States of Europe, their mutual relations, the origin of the various sovereignties and dominions, and their influence on Edward's wars and alliances. The sketch of the condition of Spain when the Black Prince undertook his fatal expedition in aid of Peter the Cruel, is perhaps the most remarkable of those descriptions, for its vigour and conciseness. The author regards Edward's reign as "representing, in the political life of the English nation, that period in the life of man, when he first arrives at manhood, begins to feel his strength, and dares to use it. Since the reign of King John, and his unsuccessful struggle with the Barons, the people by a continued opposition to attempted irresponsible power, which culminated in the establishment of a representative system of Government, had been forging constitutional weapons for future use, and slowly learning their possible application. But it was not until this reign, that they availed themselves of their knowledge, and turned it to practical account." There is so much of the brilliant, the romantic, the picturesque, so much of war

and chivalry, of pomp, and poetry, in the life of Edward, and that of his gallant, wrong-headed, reckless, famous son, that it must have been a sore temptation to dwell rather upon the features of the time, than upon its political and commercial developments, to follow the King and the Prince to the stricken field, rather than to linger with the Parliament, and watch the action of the burgesses and the corporations. But Mr. Longman is a strictly just historian. "Cloth of gold" does not lord it over "cloth of frieze" with him. Another point deserving of notice is his manner of delineating the character and influence of the Queen, the due importance he assigns to Philippa of Hainault, and his recognition of the public calamity inflicted by her death on England.

Chief among the claims to critical approbation and general interest which Mr. Longman's admirable work sustains, is that of the importance, the lucidity, and the impartiality of the chapters devoted to the elucidation of the condition of Ireland during the reign of Edward III., a miserable and deplorable record, which has found but too many repetitions since the Plantagenet times. Briefly, but without the omission of any important element, without the glossing over of any item in the awful sum of the iniquity of England's treatment of her unruly conquest, Mr. Longman states the case, and exposes the "insane policy," whereof the results are patent, even to the present time; the sowing of the seed, whose harvest of turmoil and inextinguishable animosity every English statesman has had to reap ever since. Writing of the statute, passed in 1357, forbidding marriages between the English and the Irish, the author says:—

"It may be confidently asserted that no other conquered race was ever punished by its conquerors with such wholesale confiscation of its landed property, as was the Irish by the English; and the peculiar tenure of land which prevailed in Ireland, and which gave every man belonging to the soil a kind of share or interest in it, increased that bitter feeling, and has perpetuated it even to the present day. But there was another peculiar feature in the relations between the English and Irish at that time. The English who settled in Ireland desired the friendship of the Irish, and their children were often put out to wet nurse with the native Irish. The nurses' children thus frequently became attached to their foster brethren, and the seeds of a friendship between the two races were thus sown. The insane policy of England checked this friendship, and a statute was passed to prevent this particular development of it. The statute recited that 'Whereas by marriages and divers other ties, and the nursing of infant children among the English dwelling in the Marches, and the Irish, infinite destructions and other evils have happened hitherto, we will and command that such marriages to be contracted between English and Irish, and other private ties and nursing of infant children, shall from henceforth cease, and be altogether done away.'"

The object of these iniquitous laws, and the causes which led to their enactment, are treated very ably in the first chapter of the second volume, which deals with the time when, after the death of King David, there was peace between England and Scotland, but when the former kingdom was "sorely vexed" by Ireland.

"It is impossible," says the author, "to avoid contrasting Edward's treatment of Scotland with that of England. From the beginning, indeed, how-

ever desirous the kings of England may have been to subdue Scotland, no attempt was ever made to exercise over it that tyrannous despotism which, in early times at least, always characterized the English government of Ireland. The same remarks may be made with reference to the Norman conquest of England. It is true that the Norman conquerors of the English exercised oppression, and were rapacious in appropriating their lands, yet they ultimately became one people with them. The sons and daughters of the two races intermarried, the Norman conquerors lived with the people whom they had subdued, the Norman kings stayed in the country, and the Normans at last became Englishmen ; whereas, in Ireland, no greater crime could be committed than for an English conqueror to marry or to be friends with the Irish whom he had brought under subjection, and was ordered to enslave, nor might he even adopt their customs or pastimes, or learn their language."

The author then proceeds to show that the cause of this lamentable legislation was that a certain portion of the English, to whom Irish lands were granted, became attached to the people and the country, and then endeavoured to become independent of England. The policy of England was to make the settlers aliens in the land.

The account given by the author of the political divisions of Ireland at the time of the invasion of Henry II. is remarkably lucid, and his further narrative of the landing of Strongbow, and the grants made by Henry to his barons, with the ceaseless strife to which they gave rise, and the turbulent story of the successive Viceroys, is given with such succinct power as to make that little known episode in the history of England's dealings with her conquered, deeply effective, and suggestive to all thoughtful minds. Mr. Longman records how every ingenious means of oppression was resorted to, how enmity between the English and Irish was encouraged, how castles were built to protect the settlers, and acts of childish silly tyranny added to the larger measures of wrong. The natives who were employed to build these castles, and who had to cut the passes through the rocks, were forbidden to use the Irish axe. The story is melancholy to read, and when one thinks of its repetition later, with all the added bitterness, that the foes came in the guise of heretics in religion, as well as aliens in race, the long lapse of evil days which ensued excites no wonder. A fiercely romantic element pervades the story of the Viceroys, of King John's war on his own representative, of Henry's interference with the ecclesiastical preferment of the Irish priesthood, of the desperate resistance of the Septs, and the establishment of the "liberties." The reign of Edward III. commenced amid much disquiet in Ireland, and witnessed many romantic incidents in the tumultuous and melancholy history of the island. The policy of oppression and degradation excited by Edward's fear that the English lords settled in Ireland, and gradually becoming united with the people, would rise successfully against his rule, was relentlessly pursued, and cruelty and injustice reached their height in the infamous Statute of Kilkenny.

"This statute recapitulated all former ordinances, again forbade marriages between the English and Irish, ordered the use of the English language and English customs, and entered with such minuteness into the habits of daily life, that the Irish were forbidden to ride on horseback, except in saddles

according to the English custom. National games, such as 'hurlings and quoitings,' were forbidden, the practice of the old Irish system of law, which had been in use since the conversion of the people to Christianity in the fifth century, was made unlawful, and all means were taken for the utter subjugation of the country. Of course this statute did not give peace to Ireland." . . . The general result may be thus summarized. "It is beyond dispute that the land of Ireland was held, according to the Brehon law, in a way peculiar to that country, by which every Irishman was considered to possess a certain proprietorship in it; that the English settlers, by order of the English kings, systematically disregarded that law, and acted as rapacious conquerors; and that when they showed symptoms of ceasing to do so, the English kings stepped in and forbade any approach to friendship with the Irish. Can it be matter of surprise, then, that a nation so imaginative, such a worshipper of tradition, so intensely national as the Irish, refuses to forget these things, cherishes the recollection of oppression long since past away, and still ignorantly believes that the right of the whole people to the soil is not and never can be extinguished?"

It is not too much to say of Mr. Longman's work that it stands alone in its treatment of this subject; that the student of history who would know how the case of Ireland really stood in those old times, will resort to this book. The warlike episodes of Edward's reign are selected with striking effect, and with a sympathetic spirit which lends them a strong attraction; and the concluding chapters in which the author sums up the incidents of the king's reign, which rose in splendour, attained supreme glory, and declined in shame and failure—a reign which may be compared with that of Solomon for its promise, its performance, and its melancholy decadence—are remarkable for their power, their conciseness, and their judicial calmness of tone.

---

*The Handbook of the Year 1868. A Register of Facts, Dates, and Events at Home and Abroad. With Appendices, containing Diplomatic and State Papers, Acts of Parliament, Official Documents, &c., and carefully compiled Statistical and other Tables.* By G. H. TOWNSEND, Author of "The Manual of Dates," &c. London: Wyman & Sons.

THIS most useful volume is an elaborate and skilful compendium of information concerning current events, and subjects of general importance and interest, surpassing the Annual Register in completeness, in diversity, and in the method of its arrangement, which renders reference perfectly easy and simple. It would be difficult to believe that any one could have executed this laborious and arduous task more thoroughly than it has been fulfilled by Mr. Townsend, whose melancholy and untimely death is so great a loss to literature in many ways. The book is a model of conciseness and precision, and more than realizes the design set forth in the editor's preface. It is a trustworthy record of the principal changes, transactions, and events that have occurred in all parts of the globe during the year to which it is devoted. It not only records those things, but it supplies the necessary

links to connect the Past with the Present, and in reference to persons who have attained eminence, or closed their career during the period embraced in the Handbook, it gives biographical notices remarkable for their accuracy and conciseness.

The book is divided into three parts. The first is an alphabetical register of facts, dates, and events, in fact a compendious history of the year, and is particularly rich in biographical notices. The second is a chronological register of occurrences, foreign and domestic. The third part consists of appendices to the alphabetical register, and includes all the principal public documents of the year. Nor is this section limited to Great Britain,—the legislative history of Europe is also carefully compiled, and the principal Foreign Cabinets are enumerated. Its fourth and fifth appendices contain all the information hitherto distributed over books of the Peerage, House of Commons, Parliamentary Guides, &c., besides containing an account of the changes in the distribution of seats effected by the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867–8. In thoroughness of design and completeness of execution we believe this Handbook of the Year 1868 to be unequalled.

---

AN accident obliges us to delay to our next number a review of the second volume of Mr. Allies's brilliant and learned work on "the Formation of Christendom." Meantime we may refer our readers to an admirable criticism which has appeared in the last number of "The Month."

---

---



## Correspondence.

---

**W**E have received the following note from the Dean of Westminster :—

The Dean of Westminster presents his compliments to the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW, and begs to call his attention to a remark which occurred in the last number of the REVIEW (p. 251), to the effect that a statement made by the Dean that “the Holy Father receives communion in a sitting posture” is “the purest romance.”

The statement which is thus described as “the purest romance,” or (in the words of the work to which the DUBLIN REVIEW refers with commendation) as “absolutely false,” is as follows :—“At the reception of the Holy Communion, whilst others kneel, the Pope sits.”

The authorities for this statement are numerous. Three are selected, from the 13th, from the 17th, and from the 19th century :—

(1.) Durandus, Chaplain and Auditor of the Sacred Palace, and Legate to Gregory X. at the Council of Lyons, in his work on *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* (iv. 54, p. 203).—“The Roman Pontiff . . . *ascending his seat, there communicates*” (“*Romanus Pontifex, ascendens sedem, ibi communicat*”).

(2.) Cardinal Bona, in his “*Rerum Liturgicarum*,” lib. ii. c. 17, 8, vol. iii. p. 395.—“The chief Pontiff, when he solemnly celebrates, *communicates sitting*” (“*Summus Pontifex, cum solemniter celebrat, sedens communicat*”).

(3.) The Abbé Gerbet, afterwards Archbishop of Perpignan, in his “*Rome Chrétienne*,” ii. 86, 87.—“Le Pape descend de l’autel, traverse le sanctuaire et monte au siège Pontifical. Là à demi-assis, quoique inclinant par respect, *il communie* . . . . *L’attitude du Pape et cette communion . . . retracent la première communion des Apôtres assis à la table du Sauveur.*”

We forwarded this note to the Rev. Alexius Mills, whose book we were noticing in the sentence to which Dean Stanley refers. Mr. Mills replies as follows :—

SIR,—The Dean of Westminster has asserted that, “at the reception of the Holy Communion, whilst others kneel, he (the Pope) sits.” This statement a writer in the DUBLIN REVIEW designates as “the purest romance”; and in a little pamphlet, criticising the remarks of the Dean, I have said of this, his assertion, that it is “absolutely false,” though of course I did not mean, nor

would any one who read my pamphlet understand me to mean, that he knew it to be false. The Dean of Westminster has now quoted three authorities in support of his statement. Before examining them, it will perhaps be better to state the case just as it has been brought before the public lately.

To a well-known magazine (*Good Words*) Dean Stanley contributed two articles, entitled, "Some Characteristics of the Papacy." In his introduction, the writer declared his intention to be, "not to attack nor to defend but only to discuss this great dignitary (the Pope) calmly, dispassionately, and charitably." There was to be no prejudice and no mistake ; least of all no slander and no calumny. He knew that those whom he was addressing (thanks to the candour of their teachers for 300 years) were as ignorant of all concerning the Head of Christendom as they were of the longitude. And one of the statements he puts before this most enlightened class is that, "at the reception of Holy Communion, whilst others kneel, he (the Pope) sits." This is certainly a general sweeping assertion, without limitation, without mention of any exception. Yet all the while it is absolutely undeniable, that on nearly every day throughout the year the Holy Father celebrates Mass and communicates, *standing* at an altar, like any one of his priests. The only question that can by any possibility be raised is regarding his posture at Communion on three or four extraordinary festival days during the whole twelve months. Were it even true that on these few great occasions, for some symbolical purpose, the Pope does sit to receive, still the statement of the Dean of Westminster, as it stands, would be most inaccurate. But what if there be no truth at all in it ?

May we ask, who was it that Dean Stanley intended to write about when he was preparing the articles which I am considering ? Was it the Pontiff of the present day, or of the present century, or of ten ages ago ? I do not put this question through any fear I have regarding our ground in antiquity, but merely for the sake of fairness. They who read his papers, which appeared a few months ago, did they think he was speaking of the Papacy of the present time, or that of centuries past ? Why, he himself declared, in those very articles, that he wished "to discuss the great dignitary," who had survived (to use his own objectionable language) "his defunct brother the Emperor, who disappeared in 1815." Then most unmistakably the Dean of Westminster meant to discuss the Papacy of the present century ; and if so, he has no right to disregard the assertions of modern liturgical writers, or to think them of no value by the side of more ancient authors upon the same subject. Upon points of discipline, one Pontiff is just as absolute as another, and the Church admits of change and diversity in these matters. The Catholic Church is a living organization, not a dead fossil, and any writer of whom she approves is an authority for the age in which he writes, God the Spirit being with her always in all her judgments. Now Dr. Baggs (an approved authority upon this point) writes regarding the Pontifical High Mass, "The Pope *does not* receive sitting, as Eustace and others assert. . . . When the subdeacon has reached the throne, the Pope adores the Sacred Host, the Cardinal Deacon then takes the chalice and shows it to the Pope and the people. . . . it is carried by the deacon to the Pope, who, having adored, *remains standing*" (Pont. Mass. Baggs. 1840). But the Dean of

Westminster does not think much of any modern writer upon liturgies or rubrics, although he himself quotes Gerbet, who is of no authority whatever, and never pretended to be, in liturgical matters. When I come, a little later on, to examine the quotations which my opponent advances as favouring his side, I shall then find the proper opportunity to speak of that work of the able and saintly Archbishop of Perpignan which Dean Stanley has so thoroughly misapprehended. But at present I wish to do his pleasure, and to give him all the benefit of what ancient liturgical writers say.

Moreri, the eighteenth edition of whose great work was published in 1740, writes thus upon our subject :—" Il (le sous-diacre) porte la Hostie au Pape, qui adore par une profonde inclination de la moitié du corps, *pourtant en se tenant debout.*" Patricio and Marcello have these words :—" Postquam Pontifex pacem dederit episcopo, capite discooperto, ascendit ad sedem eminentem, *et ibi stans,*" &c. Catalani, their commentator, says :—" These ceremonies come down to us "*ab antiquissimis temporibus.*" Cajetan writes :—" Papa vadit ad sedem suam, *et stando,* detecto capite, expectat subdiaconum cum patenâ et Hostiâ, et diaconum cum calice et Sanguine." Upon which the old commentator remarks :—" Similia legere est in variis Missæ Pontificalis ordinibus, ex Codicibus Vaticanis, ab erudito Georgio descriptis." The "Ordo" of Urban VIII. says :—" Cum Pontifex pervenerit ad sedem, ubi *stans* expectat Sacramentum," &c. And further on :—" Subdiaconus accipit patenam cum Sacramento, et discedens vadit ad sedem eminentem, ubi est Pontifex, qui inclinatus, flectens genua, cum accesserit subdiaconus cum Sacramento, *statim surgit.*" Again, speaking of the reception of the chalice, we read in the same "Ordo" of Urban VIII. :—" Pontifex genuflexus, Sanguinem adorât et *statim surgit.*" And immediately afterwards occur these words :—" Interim Pontifex *stans apud sedem ut prius,* dicit, 'Quod ore,' " &c. Crispus, of whom his commentator writes that he was "*Diu versatus in praxi cæremoniæ Capellæ Papalis*" (he was in fact subdeacon to Clement XI.) says, "Dum vero ibidem Pontifex in cathedram *stans,* et *veluti erectus in Cruce,* Sanguinem sugit, demonstrat," &c. And they take care to tell us when the Pontiff *does* sit down. Thus Crispus and Catalani say, "*Factâ purificatione*" (that is, of course, after Communion), "*mitram accipit et sedens,*" &c. So also the "Ordo" of Urban VIII., "*Peractâ Communionem, Pontifex acceptâ mitrâ, sedit,*" &c. It is mentioned as an event worth remembering that on Easter Sunday, 1481, Sixtus IV. was obliged by infirmity to sit during the Communion of High Mass. Would this be entitled to notice as something extraordinary if it were the rule, that "*whilst others kneel, he (the Pope) sits ?*"

And now, having perhaps quoted sufficiently from other authors, it will be only fair to examine into those cited by the Dean of Westminster, as supporting his assertion. They are, Durandus, Cardinal Bona, and Archbishop Gerbet. I will look into them one by one. The Dean having stated, that "*at the reception of the Holy Communion the Pope sits,*" produces as an authority, in the first place, Durandus. I maintain that Durandus says just the contrary. What he says is this :—" Romanus Pontifex ad sedem communicat ;" that is, "*receives at the throne.*" Then, later on, occur these words :—" Post osculum pacis, ad sedem ascendens, ibique *consistens* universis

cernentibus," &c. And lastly (after quoting a symbolical interpretation, from lib. vi. c. 9, de Myst. Miss.), he concludes thus:—"Secundum Inn. III., igitur ascendens sedem, ibi communicat." This is all that Durandus says in the "Rationale," in connection with our subject. "Ascendere ad sedem" does not signify to sit down, but "to go up to the throne." "Ascendens ad sedem," or "ad sedem eminentem," is the common phrase when speaking of the procession of the Sovereign Pontiff from any place to his throne. So, in fact, what Durandus states is just this: that, after the "Pax," the Pope goes up to his throne, and ("ibi consistens," "there standing") receives. Exactly what the rubric lays down.

With regard to Cardinal Bona, it is true that in describing the peculiarities of the Pontifical Communion on the few solemn occasions that occur each year, he *does* say, "The chief Pontiff when he solemnly celebrates communicates sitting." But a dozen lines farther on we find these words:—"These details are taken from a ceremonial of the Papal Chapel. They differ in some parts from the instructions laid down in *the most ancient Roman 'Ordo,'* as any one can see who will compare the two together." This remark comes in the very same paragraph with the statement quoted by the Dean of Westminster, yet it appears to have escaped his observation. It is almost like a disclaimer on the part of Bona, of any responsibility for the correctness of all the details of what he has been describing. Moreover, it is quite evident (and must be seen to be so by any who will read the passage) that Bona is not there stating like a rubrician what is to be done or left undone—he is merely describing the ceremony of the Pope's Communion on extraordinary occasions, and he concludes by saying, "The details I have given come in a certain work which differs from the Roman '*Ordo.*'" Having no clue to the unknown writer whom he quotes, it is impossible to pass an opinion upon him; but is it quite fair to cite the Cardinal as an authority against us, without stating that he himself takes care to say, "These details are not mine; I found them in a work which, I am aware, differs in several points from the admitted authority in these matters"? Is an historian ever considered responsible for the assertion of a fact about which he says nothing of his own knowledge one way or the other, which he tells us he takes from a writer of whom at the same time he gives this damaging testimony: "What I relate I have taken from a pamphlet which is at variance with the highest authority"?

As the third writer who speaks in his favour, the Dean of Westminster quotes Archbishop Gerbet. I cannot think that he has treated quite fairly this illustrious ecclesiastic. He has put a character upon him which this venerable and saintly man would have been the last to assume. Whilst expressing the utmost respect for this noble scholar, we say confidently that he never wrote one line that is of authority in rubrical matters. His admirable "Sketch of Christian Rome" contains some of the finest prose writing in the French language; but the work itself has no more to do with rubrics than the "differential calculus," or "the art of shipbuilding." Of the fourteen works published by Gerbet, not one is rubrical. One might as well call "Eustace's Tour," or Maguire's "Rome and her Ruler," authorities on the Liturgy and the Rubrics, as assert the same of the splendid "Esquisse." But, after all, what does Gerbet say? "Il (le Pape) monte au siège pontifical.

*Là à demi assis*, quoique incliné par respect, il communie." Now, "*à demi*," as all know, is an adverbial phrase, which means "almost," "not quite"; so, in fact, one of the authorities quoted as asserting that the Pope receives *sitting*, says in reality that he receives "not quite sitting." It is evident that Gerbet means nothing more than what Moreri (quoted above) lays down as the rule; viz., "*Il adore par une profonde inclination de la moitié du corps, pourtant se tenant debout*," which is precisely the position.

And now to sum up this case. The Dean of Westminster has stated that "at the reception of the Holy Communion while others kneel, he (the Pope) sits." Had he even said the following:—Through nearly the whole year the Pope communicates standing, but upon three or four solemn occasions during the twelve months he receives in a sitting posture; even then his statement would have been erroneous. As it stands at present, it is perfectly indefensible. He says the three authorities he has quoted "are quite conclusive." I must leave your readers to say on which side the conclusiveness is to be found. He has quoted one writer (Durandus) who is express against him; and a second (Bona) who takes care to tell us that he is quoting a work which differs in some points from the established authority; and a third (Gerbet) who is no authority, and who yet does not agree with him. Had he no recollection of a host of approved writers, whom he could most easily have consulted, and in whose works he would have found every minutest detail of the gorgeous ceremonial of the Pontifical High Mass? If he recollected them, why did he not consult them?

I remain, Sir,

Faithfully yours,

ALEXIUS MILLS.

P.S.—Describing the ceremony of Maundy Thursday, Marcellus says, on this day the Pope does not sit even when he has washed his hands after Communion, "but stands without his mitre, out of reverence for the Sacrament." He keeps this posture, of course, because the Sacred Host consecrated for the next day is still upon the Altar. Rocca says, "*Summus Pontifex ad solium stans, non sedens*," &c., and then a few lines further he adds, "These facts I mention for the benefit of those who have never witnessed the Pontifical Communion, or, if they have been present, perhaps could not distinctly perceive its peculiar rite." I ought to have noticed before that Rocca refers to the very passage of Durandus that has been urged against us, and evidently had not the slightest idea that the latter did not agree with him as to the Pope's posture at Holy Communion. It may be asked who was Rocca, and what is the weight of his authority on this question? He was chosen corrector of the proofs of the Sixtine Bible, and is said by his biographers "to have excelled all others in ecclesiastical knowledge." On account of his perfect acquaintance with rubrics and the liturgies, he was appointed Apostolic Sacristan by Pope Clement VIII. He furnishes us with a proof that no weight could have been attached to the opinion of the unknown writer mentioned by Cardinal Bona, at all events at the time when the Cardinal made the quotation. For Rocca was Papal Sacristan from 1593 until 1621. His great work, from which we have cited, was a leading authority

on such questions as the present as early as 1573. It has kept its position until this day. Cardinal Bona wrote his books on the liturgy when the work of Rocca was law in Rome, when the author's reputation was at its highest, and when the "Ordo" of Urban VIII. had just appeared ! I will only add at present that Aimon, a writer of the eleventh century, in a work entitled "Tableau de la Cour de Rome," agrees with what has been asserted by me ; so does another ancient rubrician, whose name I cannot discover, but of whom "Migne" says, he lived "fort antérieur au neuvième siècle." "The Dean of Westminster has asserted that "the authorities for his statement are numerous." I am obliged to confess that the little labour I have taken in search of them has not been rewarded by the discovery of a single one.

This letter appears to us decisive on the matter of fact. But we must admit, on reflection, that our own words, "the purest romance," were too strong for the occasion, and we must apologize to the Dean for their use. In fact the writer of the notice was wholly unaware that any Catholic writer of name had given the least colour for such a statement as Dean Stanley's.

---

WE have much pleasure in publishing a letter on Catholic higher education, from the Rev. Dr. Gillow, Vice-President of S. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw.

### CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION.

*To the Editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW.*

DEAR SIR,—May I beg the favour of making, in the cause of truth and justice, a few statements of fact bearing upon the opinion which at present so commonly prevails regarding the kind of education offered to English lay Catholics ?

It has been so long the habitual practice of Catholic journalists and other writers to speak of the education given in our Catholic colleges as extremely deficient, that the opinion seems now to pass current as a thing quite indisputable. Following this impression, a writer in the last number of the DUBLIN REVIEW, in the article on the "Principles of Catholic Higher Education" (p. 88), assumes the prevalent opinion as an acknowledged fact, and expresses the assumption in the following explicit terms :—

"Higher education, we need hardly say, is for the comparatively leisured classes, for those who can carry on their education to the age of twenty-one or twenty-two, and not only to that of eighteen or nineteen. At present *no system whatever of higher education is offered to English lay Catholics.*"

This statement cannot certainly be reproached for any want of clearness or comprehensiveness. Still, however derogatory it may be to our Catholic colleges, I do not blame the Reviewer, because he professedly relies on the



statements of others. From the "Month" of October last he quotes as follows :—

"If . . . . the universality of a particular topic of conversation amongst our higher and middle classes is a true index of the feeling of Catholics, there can be little doubt that the great want which makes itself more and more urgently felt amongst us, is a liberal education analogous to that given at Oxford and Cambridge."

Again the pamphlet, "What doth it Profit a Man?" which stands at the head of his article, supplies the following quotation :—

"When boys have grown into men, we have no universities to send them to. We have schools and colleges; and though they are deficient in many points, we can content ourselves with them. But at the very period at which the mind is most capable of receiving impressions, and at which the character is fashioned and stamped for life—when the energies and powers of the intelligence are most keen and are open to the greatest peril—and we look around for a place to send our boy to be educated in the real sense of the word, and formed into a man, nothing but blankness presents itself to us."

In these passages it is emphatically denied,—1. That there exists anywhere in England a regular course of Catholic education for laymen carrying them beyond the age of eighteen or nineteen.

2. That any system whatever of higher education is offered to English lay Catholics.

These statements, however, are *untrue*, and the fact of their being so often repeated merely makes it evident that the Reviewer, not less than those on whose statements he relies, is wholly unacquainted with the system of education regularly carried on, at all events in the college about which alone my experience enables me to speak with full knowledge. For, had the Reviewer been correctly informed upon that system, he could not possibly have committed himself so explicitly to statements so contrary to the fact and of such easy refutation.

It is not pleasant to find oneself compelled to come forward to speak about one's own college, nor would anything short of the demands of truth and justice, not only to that house in particular, but much more to the interests of those whose ignorance of the truth may result in their grievous prejudice, not to mention the credit justly due to the Catholic body for what it has done for education, have induced me to lay before the public that which is already sufficiently known to those who are more intimately connected with that college. In so doing, however, I trust I may say—*non ero insipiens; veritatem enim dicam*.

My object, then, is, by a simple statement of facts, to show, in opposition to the above two denials—

1. That our ordinary course of education for laymen does carry men up to the very ages at which, according to the Reviewer, higher education ought to terminate.

2. That the ordinary course of education does impart all that instruction which he considers higher education ought to embrace.

Taking the college as a whole, the respective numbers of lay and eccle-

siastical students, amounting together to about 300, are almost equally balanced, the former being more numerous in the lower, and the latter in the upper classes. The educational course for laymen terminates with the higher philosophy inclusively, and at the time when the ecclesiastical students pass into theology. Up to this point no distinction whatever is made between the lay and ecclesiastical students, so that no one need necessarily know, from any rule or custom of the college, or from any visible action of superiors, who are studying for secular life or who are aspiring to the ecclesiastical state. To the end of the higher philosophy, the intellectual, moral, and religious training, and the subjects of study, are exactly the same for all students, without distinction, and the higher philosophy is as much intended for laymen as is any one of the classes in which grammar is taught. Hence it follows that if the ecclesiastics have the benefit of higher education—and this the writer of the article willingly admits—the laymen have the same; for he does not include theology in his programme of higher education; and even if he had included it, it might be observed that there has been an occasional instance of a layman taking a course of dogmatic theology; and were the same desire repeated, no objection would be raised.

1. Now at what age do the students usually complete their higher philosophy? The average age is *twenty-two* or upwards. I have before me the names and ages of the students in three of the upper classes, whose mean ages, brought to the period of completing their philosophy, are for the three classes respectively, 22·80, 22·25, and 22·10. Thus the average age to which the ordinary course of education carries the lay students is somewhat *above the extreme age* at which the Reviewer would have higher education to terminate. And this must naturally result from the number of classes that have to be gone through in the ordinary course of studies. For the preparatory school (or "Seminary") has four classes occupying as many years, and the college course has seven. These seven comprise three classes of lower humanities and four of higher studies, called respectively, in ascending order, Poetry, Rhetoric, Lower Philosophy, and Higher Philosophy. Thus the entire course for laymen, which is a progressive system of eleven classes, covers a period of eleven years. Consequently, if a boy enter the Seminary at the early age of ten, he is twenty-one when he arrives at the end of his philosophy; if at the age of eleven, he is twenty-two,—the very ages specified as the proper period to which higher education ought to continue. As a matter of fact, more boys, on their entrance into the Seminary, are over eleven years of age than under ten.

Nothing, then, can be more wide of the fact than the assertion that no system of education is offered to laymen to carry them beyond the age of eighteen or nineteen.

2. But is the education thus offered of the kind required by the writer for his "system of higher education"?

Fortunately it is the express object of the whole article to point out what course of studies ought to be comprised in the system of higher education, which, it is asserted, nowhere exists in England for Catholic laymen. But in so doing he has traced out most accurately the very subjects (though not all of them) on which the four higher classes are engaged. If his object had

been to unfold what actually exists in the ordinary course of instruction, and to show that nothing is wanting to his ideal of a perfect *curriculum* of higher education for laymen, he could hardly have fulfilled his task more satisfactorily, for he would have failed only by omission.

But to look at the matter in another light ; quoting from the "Month," the Reviewer says "that the great want which makes itself more and more urgently felt amongst us is a liberal education analogous to that given at Oxford and Cambridge."

The term *liberal education* implies a great deal more than the course of studies pursued and the instruction imparted by professors. But limiting our attention at present to this, I should infer from the above words that the writer would agree that, if the education were such as to qualify young men to graduate in either of the specified universities, it would so far satisfy this supposed want of a liberal education.

But higher attainments are required to graduate at London than at either of our old universities. The *curriculum* of the London University embraces a greater number of subjects, and exacts a higher standard in those subjects as the condition for passing the examinations. This is admitted on all hands ; indeed it is the constant complaint that the requirements for the London degree of B.A. are unreasonably high ; and a strong proof that there is foundation for this complaint is furnished by the fate of the vast majority of those who strive to obtain that degree.

To understand the just value of this argument it must be borne in mind that the London University is not a *teaching* but only an *examining* body. Its credit, then, as a university, depends entirely on the standard of its examinations. The programmes for these are issued a year and a half in advance, and candidates are invited to present themselves competently prepared, for it is well known that a man has no chance of "passing" unless he be competently prepared on *every subject* required. Under these circumstances it is not likely that men who do not at least consider themselves adequately prepared, will ever present themselves for examination. Hence that large body of men of weak abilities or negligent habits, who are found, certainly not less in the colleges of the universities than in other colleges,—of men who, at the universities, spend the great portion of their time in hunting, boating, riding, wine parties, &c., and very little at their books,—of men who are attracted to the universities rather by the prestige of the name, or the society to be there found, than by any desire of learning, and who never could be qualified to "pass" at any respectable examination, are wholly eliminated from the London examinations. For, as these are purely voluntary, they can present no attractions except to those to whom it is an object to possess a testimonial of proficiency.

What, then, under these circumstances, is the numerical proportion of those who succeed in gaining the London degree of B.A. compared with those who fail ? If I say that out of six candidates only one succeeds, while five fail to pass the examinations, I shall not be far wide of the actual fact ; for, on an average, almost one half fail at each of the three examinations which have to be passed for the degree, so that only about one-sixth are fortunate enough to pass them all. To illustrate this I will instance the results of the

three examinations of the past year, 1868, as given in the University Calendar. At the matriculation examinations in January and June the number of candidates was 736, of whom 388 passed ; at the first examination for B.A., held in July, the candidates were 198, and 123 passed ; and at the examination for the degree in October, out of 160 candidates, 66 passed. According to these results ( $\frac{388}{736} \times \frac{123}{198} \times \frac{66}{160} = \frac{1}{4}$ ) it appears that out of 740 candidates only 100 have the good fortune to graduate. The previous years yield a result somewhat higher, the total ratio for the last three years being  $\frac{1}{3}$ . The percentage, then, of those who obtain the degree is under 16, while over 84 per cent. are dropped at one or other of the three examinations. Now these 84 per cent. are men who have seriously prepared for the examinations to which they have voluntarily presented themselves. They do not belong at all to that class of university men of whom I have spoken as wholly eliminated from the London examinations, and who are, nevertheless, said to constitute 70 per cent. of the Oxford *graduates*.

The London standard compared with that of Oxford must, therefore, be very high, and if all the men who graduate at Oxford or Cambridge were subjected to the London test, the number of B.A.'s would be marvellously diminished.

But are our studies carried so high as to qualify for the London University B.A. by the time when young men have completed the ordinary course of education offered to laymen ? For if they be, then it must be conceded that, in this respect, the ordinary course does offer to English lay Catholics a system of education certainly not inferior to that which is offered to those of a corresponding age who graduate at Oxford or Cambridge.

In 1863 an arrangement was made in the order of studies so as to introduce, along with other subjects, the matter required for the London University examinations into three of the classes of higher studies, called respectively, Poetry, Rhetoric, and Lower Philosophy. The reason for this change was not because the new order of studies was thought to be an improvement on the existing system, but because, when the London University had offered to Catholics the means of taking university degrees without the necessity of their going up to London even for the examinations, it was thought expedient to enable the students of the college to avail themselves of this advantage ; and it was also hoped that further evidence would be thus afforded of the fact that a university course, recognized as such by the world, could be had in a Catholic college and degrees taken by Catholics without the necessity of their frequenting Protestant universities.

By the arrangement referred to, the students in the class called Poetry prepare the matter for matriculation at London, those in Rhetoric the matter for the first examination for B.A., and those in the class of Lower Philosophy the matter for the second examination, which is for the degree. Thus the men graduate at the end of their Lower Philosophy, upon which their London University course terminates.

If, then, the course for laymen were to end here, it would clearly answer all the requirements specified by the writer quoted in the DUBLIN REVIEW, as the great *desideratum* felt (as he alleges) by Catholic laymen ; namely, a

liberal education analogous in point of attainments to that given at Oxford and Cambridge.

But our ordinary course for laymen does not end with the London University course : for after they have gone through the work required at London, the lay students have still an academical year, from October to August, devoted exclusively to sound Christian moral philosophy in all its branches. And this, it must be noticed, is after they have acquired such a knowledge of philosophy as will enable them to graduate ; for, unfortunately, moral philosophy is one of the subjects of examination for the London B.A. By this additional year of philosophy the lay students are furnished with an antidote against the infidelity which, under the abused name of philosophy, poisons all non-Catholic universities, and contaminates modern literature with principles subversive of those essential truths on which depend not only the doctrines of revelation, but even the primary dictates of our intellectual and moral nature.

If what is here described be not enough to constitute a system of higher education, of which it is said that "at present no system whatever is offered to English lay Catholics," I shall be curious to know what more than this English Catholics require or expect. As the liberal education given at Oxford seems, according to the citation from the *Month*, to present such an object of envy to Catholics of the middle and upper classes, I am still more curious to know what advantages superior to those thus offered in a Catholic college would be expected from graduating at Oxford, either as resident or non-resident members. This is a point well deserving of unprejudiced investigation, for possibly the Oxford degree and honours may not merit that high estimation in which the fashion of conversation is said to hold them.

Before speaking on this point, I must observe that I entirely leave out of view those immensely superior advantages peculiar to the great universities, of which, however, Catholics cannot possibly avail themselves : I mean the fellowships, and scholarships, and rich livings, and lucrative posts in the gift of the universities. These not only operate as stimulants to exertion for the sake of the prizes to be won by success in the sphere of eminence, but they are frequently the first occasions which engender habits of study, a thirst for learning, and an ardent pursuit of it for its own sake. No one can be insensible to the justness of the pride which Oxford especially feels in the array of distinguished scholars, and lawyers, and statesmen, and other great men whose names adorn its calendar. But these men, it must be observed, were not made eminent by simply going through the series of terms preparatory to taking their degree. The emoluments of the university, or their own social position, enabled them to pursue their literary labours, often as an occupation, far beyond the ordinary period of university studies, while the university supplied ample means to aid them in their favourite pursuits. It was in this manner that they were enabled to perfect themselves, and by their own exertions to acquire that pre-eminence which forms the just glory of the university. No man becomes learned by his education under the instruction of teachers. Educational training under learned men may show a man how to become learned ; but if he succeed, the merit must be due to

his subsequent labours. Our colleges have no fellowships, and they cannot, therefore, pretend to do more than offer a solid course of higher education corresponding to that offered to men of like age who go through the ordinary university course preparatory to taking the university degree and corresponding honours. I speak, then, of that very course of liberal education given at Oxford, of which Catholics are said to feel the want so severely, and, comparing like with like, I purpose to show that what they already possess affords an education of higher perfection than would be afforded them in that renowned seat of learning.

Upon this subject I beg to call particular attention to another article in the DUBLIN REVIEW of October last, on "The Present and Future of Oxford University." The statements made in this article, based as they are on testimony so fully reliable, are such as to render it impossible for a Catholic to reflect upon them without arriving at a deliberate conviction that the Oxford degree of B.A. is of no value whatever as an evidence of intellectual attainments, and that the Oxford honours are little better than a certificate for shallow unbelief.

A short time before reading this article in the DUBLIN REVIEW, I had been told by a Protestant gentleman, who had been at Oxford, that the requirements for the Oxford degree were contemptibly low. This did not surprise me as being anything very different from my previous impressions; and after this I still shared the opinion (I may now say the delusion) so common among Catholics, and supported by a portion of the Catholic press, that to be able to add to one's name the Oxford B.A. was a privilege of some value, as, at least, an acknowledged evidence of a fair standard of intellectual culture. But the statements made in the article in question, and on the authority of such unsuspected witnesses as Mr. Pattison and Mr. Goldwin Smith, friends of the university, did, I must admit, greatly surprise me. As the information was new to me, I will retail a small portion of it, and this rather in the hope of causing the article to be read than of doing justice to the startling conclusions to which, as stated above, its statements lead.

First, then, as regards the Oxford degrees. Mr. M. Pattison, B.D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, complains that fully 70 per cent. of the so-called "students" at Oxford are in no sense, even in profession, students at all. (DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1868, p. 403.) The degrees gained by these, he says—

*"it is well understood, denote no grade of intellectual cultivation, but have a merely social value. They are an evidence that a youth has been able to afford not only the money, but, what is impossible to so many, the time to live three years among gentlemen, doing nothing, as a gentleman should"* (p. 408).

Still, to obtain the degree, an examination of some sort must be "passed," and must consequently be prepared for. The manner and temper in which this is done is thus described by Mr. Pattison :—

*"The preparation for these" compulsory examinations "takes up time; but the total habit of idleness is not thereby lessened. A distaste is engendered for books and reading of them, and the youth compensates himself for the*



hateful hours spent upon his 'grind' by taking all the rest of his time to 'himself.' "

The rank and character of the most influential of those who are thus prepared for examination—of those who are the leaders of the tone and fashion of the university students—are thus set forth :—

" Spoiled by the luxury of home and early habits of indulgence, the young aristocrat has lost the power of commanding the attention, and is not only indisposed for, but incapable of, work. Profound idleness and luxuriousness have corrupted his nature. He is no longer capable of being attuned to anything. He is either the foppish exquisite of the drawing-room or the barbarized athlete of the arena ; and beyond these spheres all life is to him a blank. Congregated mostly in one college, they maintain in it a tone of contempt for study, and a taste for boyish extravagance and dissipation, which infects the moral atmosphere far beyond their own circle. As they lead the fashion, and are conscious of their right to do so, in dress and manners, this social superiority gives weight and currency to their notions and opinions on moral conduct " (p. 408).

With such materials as these, and thus prepared for examination, it is not an easy thing to divine what sort of programme of examination can be drawn in order to come within their compass. But be that as it may, the result is that, while some are " plucked," a number succeed in obtaining certificates of "pass" sufficient to make up 70 per cent. of the Oxford B.A.'s.

The remaining 30 per cent. are " Honour men." Speaking of these the Rector of Lincoln College says :—

" We must not shut our eyes to the fact that the honour-students are the only students who are undergoing any educational process which it can be considered as a function of the university either to impart or to exact " (p. 412).

Then, according to this, the mere fact that a man has graduated at Oxford not only goes for absolutely nothing as an evidence of education, but, in the absence of honours, it furnishes a positive proof that a man has had no education at all such as it is the function of a university to impart ! It has, however, a social *advantage* : it proves that a man has been able to lead an expensive and dissipated life for three years among gentlemen, in the character maybe either of a " foppish exquisite of the drawing-room," or of a " barbarized athlete of the arena." Such is the estimate, according to the testimony of the Rector of Lincoln College, that is *generally* made of the value of the Oxford B.A.

In the second place, we must see what is Mr. Pattison's estimate of the worth of the honours gained by the other 30 per cent. of the Oxford graduates.

" These," he says, " receive an education which benefits them in intellect and character ; " and " as this result represents the *total product* of the University as it is at present constituted, it is natural and desirable that it should be closely scanned and criticised " (p. 412).

The honours, then, do afford evidence of intellectual culture. But is this culture of a kind that Catholics have any cause to envy ? Its chief merit, according to Mr. Pattison, lies in the philosophy that is now in the ascendant

in the teaching of the university. In the honour examinations in the school of "Litteræ Humaniores," not as these examinations are prescribed by statute, but as *actually worked*, the really important part, he says, is the examination in philosophy. Upon the nature of this philosophy he observes :—

"What must excite our wonder is the boundless space over which it ranges. There seems to be scarcely any of the debatable questions of politics, morals, or metaphysics, on which the candidate may not be asked to give his views. The horizon of the examination is as wide as that of philosophical literature" (p. 412).

Now on what philosophical principles are the honour-students of Oxford trained, so as to qualify them to express their views to the satisfaction of the examiners on this vast variety of subjects? Are they such as the Catholic Church could permit? Or are their philosophical speculations on such questions as the origin and last end of man, the immortality of the soul, the freedom of the will, and the moral responsibility of human actions, at all checked because opposed to truths divinely revealed? Not at all. They are trained upon no *principles* whatever. Their philosophy is limited to "the *results of modern thought*." This term, *modern thought*, comprises, of course, all the Atheistic, Rationalistic, Pantheistic, and sceptical forms of modern unbelief. It is with the *results* of systems—not with the systems themselves—that the honour-men of Oxford are made acquainted; and, in Mr. Pattison's opinion, there is no university in Europe where "the results of modern thought" are so readily accepted, or, as he expresses it, *are so entirely at home*, as in these Oxford examinations for honours.

"I do not believe," he says, "that there exists at this moment in Europe any public institution for education where what are called 'the results of modern thought' on all political and speculative subjects—the philosophy of religion, perhaps, alone excepted—are so entirely at home as they are in our honour examinations in the school of 'Litteræ Humaniores'" (p. 413).

Mr. Pattison, however, considers the state of philosophical training in the university to be extremely defective and unsatisfactory. It is not that he objects to the men holding the "results of modern thought;" far from it. His objection is against their holding them as *results merely*, without knowing the process of thought by which those results have been attained. Upon this point he expresses his opinion very decidedly :—

"It appears to me to be a fatal objection to our 'philosophical' course, that it encourages speculation not based upon knowledge . . . . As mental training, it is surely most unsound. It cannot be called 'philosophical.' It is 'rhetoric expended upon philosophical subjects.' Its highest outcome is the 'able editor,' who, under protection of the anonymous press, instructs the public upon all that concerns their highest interests, with a dogmatism and an assurance proportioned to his utter ignorance of the subject he is assuming to teach. In the schools of Oxford is now taught in perfection the art of writing 'leading articles'" (p. 413).

According to these statements, Oxford, in its philosophical views, is the foremost of European universities in adopting the conclusions of free-thinkers, but it is the last in those habits of thought by which conclusions are justly

drawn from premises. Its characteristic, therefore, is shallow unbelief adopted on the dictation of teachers, without any application of the minds of the pupils to the reasons why such tenets should be accepted. The causes of this are the defects inherent in the philosophical *course* itself, or manner of training ; the fruit is the clever, rhetorical, but unreasoning style in which its latitudinarian speculations are expressed by the pupils with an assurance proportioned to their ignorance.

Mr. Pattison fully admits the antagonism which subsists between this sort of philosophical training and the views of the "Catholic party," or, as he otherwise calls it, the "Church party," by which he means all those who still cling to any points of supernaturally revealed dogma. But his sympathies are not with this party, and, while he allows that their alarms are well founded, he coolly tells them that, unless they succeed in banishing this philosophy from the *curriculum* of the university, their day is gone ; for that every mind of promise that comes under its influence must assuredly yield to the power of its fascination.

"For my part," he says, "I think the fears of the Catholic party, whether within or without the National establishment, are *substantially* well founded. It is especially the philosophical subjects which have developed themselves within that school [Litteræ Humaniores] which alarm the Church party. This party must either conquer [by expelling this philosophy from the course of teaching], or be content to see all the minds that come under the influence of that training—that is, *all the minds of any promise that pass through Oxford*—hopelessly lost to them" (p. 414).

The Rector of Lincoln College here assumes as a certain fact that neither Catholics nor Tractarians can pass through the honour schools in Oxford without being *hopelessly lost* to the Catholic Church or the Tractarian party respectively. He holds, therefore, that the Oxford graduates either receive no higher education at all, or that they receive an education which must infallibly prove fatal to their faith in all supernaturally revealed truth. Thus he leaves no doubt about his estimate of the real significance of Oxford honours : they are the reward for dressing in a ready, unreasoning style the anti-Catholic conclusions of modern free-thinkers.

Surely, if this were properly understood and adequately appreciated, the so-called "liberal education" given at Oxford could be no longer an object of envy to Catholics of the middle and upper classes, and they would, perhaps, be induced to look with a more favourable eye upon the education offered to them, with less worldly circumstance but a thousand times more solidity, in their own colleges. A happy result of this would be that they would be better inclined to avail themselves more fully of the advantages which those colleges present to them.

Another beneficial result would also infallibly follow, namely, the impossibility of any of our Catholic colleges coveting the supposed privilege of affiliation with Oxford for the purpose of taking its degrees and honours, which, as now appears, I did not characterize too severely when I said that it seems impossible for a Catholic to reflect on the statements made in this article of the October number of the DUBLIN REVIEW without being convinced that the Oxford B.A. is of no value whatever as a proof of learning,

while the Oxford honours are little better than a certificate for shallow unbelief. It does indeed seem strange that, at the very time when a Catholic periodical of reputation and influence is advocating the affiliation of our Catholic colleges with the University of Oxford in preference to that of London, and is doing this on the ground that Catholics would thereby be brought into competition with men of a higher intellectual standard and one more analogous to their own, a Protestant Head of one of the Oxford colleges should come forward to inform us that the mere graduate is a man of no education which it is the function of a university to impart, and that if he be not a "foppish exquisite of the drawing-room," he is, in all probability, a "barbarized athlete of the arena," and that the highest outcome of the "Honour men" is the "able editor," trained in the art of writing "leading articles," and of instructing the public on "the results of modern thought" with an assurance equalled only by his ignorance. This, I say, is a coincidence that does appear remarkably strange.

Nothing, however, of this kind can be said of the London degrees and honours. These do afford substantial evidence, not only of proficiency, but of mental power above the ordinary average. There is evidence enough of this in the fact already enlarged upon, that, out of six who start on the London course with an earnest intent to win the distinction of B.A., only one succeeds in reaching the goal, the other five being all thrown in one stage or other of the race. Even the examination for matriculation requires written answers to ten papers of questions on as many subjects; it extends over five days, and occupies twenty-eight hours in actual writing. If young men, on leaving Eton or the other public schools, had to answer these questions upon the London standard, as the condition of reception into Oxford, can any one doubt that the number sent back would be such as to leave the halls of Oxford desolate?

But if this be the comparative value of the London and Oxford degree as an evidence of intellectual acquirements, it must follow, with the force of demonstration, that a progressive system of education, embracing in its *curriculum*, in addition to other matter, the university course required at the three examinations for the London degree of B.A., and after this a full academical year given exclusively to Christian moral philosophy, forms a system of higher education for laymen with which the "liberal education" afforded at either Oxford or Cambridge can claim no comparison whatever.

It may perhaps be said that, though the London degree may afford evidence of proficiency in knowledge, it is not, therefore, a proof of a "liberal education," because the primary end of education is not so much to impart information, as to cultivate the mind and the heart, by infusing sound principles of truth, virtue, honour, morality, self-control, and the other qualities which make up the character of a true Christian gentleman.

I must beg to observe that I have not said that the London University has adopted the best *curriculum*, viewed as a means of intellectual culture. On the contrary, I have said that among the motives which led to its adoption as part of the studies in three of our upper classes, that of improving the previously existing course of studies never entered at all. I may now add that, in several respects, the alteration was considered the reverse of an

improvement. Philosophy, for instance, presents a difficulty which is felt to be almost fatal to any connection between a Catholic college and the London University. That Catholics should have to answer questions on moral philosophy proposed by men whose philosophical views are wholly opposed to the truths of their faith, is undoubtedly a grievous hardship, and seems inconsistent with the religious toleration of which the University makes profession. To a remonstrance made on this point it was answered that the University, being open to the members of all denominations, did not profess any particular philosophical system, and that candidates would pass if they could show a competent knowledge of the received principles and systems of philosophy, whatever might be the particular views which individuals might think proper to hold. This, of course, entails on professors the necessity of exposing the false systems, and consequently that of teaching their refutation. Unsatisfactory as this may be, it would be indefinitely worse if, as at Oxford, the students had not only to be examined but taught also by the advocates of an anti-Catholic scepticism, and if the merit of the answers given by the pupils had to be estimated by their degree of accordance with the philosophical views held by the examiners.

Much less have I spoken of the London University as a school of moral training, for this would be absurd, considering that it is no more than a board of examiners, who never even come into contact at all with the examined. The moral training depends upon the spirit that animates the various houses of education at which the candidates reside. Upon this the London University exercises no influence. Between the members of the university, as such, there is no communion of thought, no bond of union whatever. I speak, then, of its degree solely as affording substantial evidence of proficiency in the subjects which it requires to be learned, on which point, it has been shown, the Oxford degree affords no evidence whatever.

As regards, then, the spirit that characterizes the various places of education as schools of moral training, if any comparison has to be made, it must lie between the spirit of discipline and the religious and moral principles which animate a Catholic college and those which pervade the Protestant universities. What the Oxford spirit is, and what are the moral effects of its training, if we had not known it before, we should have known now from the confession of one of its own heads, the Rector of Lincoln College. Compared with the Protestant universities,—those strongholds of unbelief, and worldliness and vice,—a Catholic college is a place of education in the truest and highest sense of the term. There the laymen, equally with the ecclesiastics, are trained in the practice of daily meditation; they attend mass daily, they frequent the sacraments, for the most part, every week; they have fixed hours for religious instruction and the reading of religious books; they have periodically the same spiritual exercises; they are taught to refer all their occupations to a supernatural end, and to expect success from supernatural help; they live under a vigorous and well-observed discipline, which they respect and love.

Horses, dogs, wine, cigars, dangerous books, and such-like causes of worldly distraction, have no entrance among them, nor are they on that account the less contented and cheerful. Dissolute language is unheard in their society;

propriety of conduct towards each other, dictated by charity, is the source of mutual good-fellowship and edification, while their respect and love for their superiors is no less a guarantee for uprightness of conduct than an evidence that their observance of discipline is prompted, not by human fear serving the eye, but by their faith instilling, in simplicity of heart, the fear of God.

The fruits of this discipline are the natural produce of its spirit. The great majority of laymen thus educated retain and cherish through life a singular and characteristic love of the home of their education, and their conduct in society is both an honour to the circle in which they move, and a testimony before the world of the sanctity of the Church, whose spirit they so happily imbibed while it guided the steps of their youth.

Such, then, is the nature and such are the fruits of "the system of higher education" that is offered, under the shelter of a Catholic college, to English lay Catholics.

I remain,

Faithfully yours,

JOHN GILLOW.

The questions raised by Dr. Gillow in this interesting and important letter, do not directly concern the main subject of our January article, which was on "the *principles* of Catholic higher education"; but rather concern the subject of a future article, which we have expressed our hope of writing, on the best way of carrying out those principles in practice. We will here therefore content ourselves with very few remarks.

1. We heartily agree with our correspondent, that any connection of English Catholic education with Oxford and Cambridge would produce immeasurably worse effects, than are generated by its present relations with London University.

2. As Dr. Gillow has made one particular statement, we suppose there can be no impropriety in our expressing cordial concurrence with it. We refer to his statement that "the new order of studies", introduced into Catholic colleges with a view of meeting the requirements of London University, was no "improvement on the existing system," but "in many respects the reverse of an improvement"; and that the London philosophical examination in particular is a "grievous hardship." We think indeed that the "Month" has done excellent service, in drawing attention to the grossly tyrannical and intolerant character of this examination, and to the grievous religious injury which it is calculated to inflict on the more thoughtful Catholic students.

---



## Ecclesiastical Documents.

---

**WE** publish three documents this quarter, which in different ways will much interest our readers. For the first two we are indebted to that most orthodox and valuable monthly, "The Irish Ecclesiastical Record;" which we are heartily glad to see in a new and improved dress. As the first of the two decrees is exclusively for England, we who publish in England are especially bound to notice it.

The letter which comes last is connected with the "Roman documents" on Louvain traditionalism, which we printed in January, 1868. It was addressed by the four Louvain professors to Card. de Andrea, then Prefect of the Congregation of the Index; and expressed definitely their philosophical position. Reference is made to it in p. 281 of our number for January, 1868. Our readers must, of course, carefully observe, that this exposition has been peremptorily *condemned*; and that every Catholic must ascribe therefore to the human intellect a *greater* "native power," than is admitted by the letter we publish. In these days, when philosophical studies are so greatly on the increase, this letter will be found by many an invaluable beacon, as expressing so clearly, temperately, and ably an error, which all Catholics must carefully avoid.

### I. RECENT DECREE OF THE HOLY OFFICE ON THE MANNER OF RECEIVING CONVERTS INTO THE CHURCH.

#### *Beatissime Pater*

"Inter decreta primæ Synodi Provincialis Westmonasteriensis sub. C. XVI. n. 8., ubi sermo est de abjuratione Protestantium adulatorum, et de baptismo sub conditione eis conferendo, additur 'Confessio etiam sacramentalis semper in tali casu est exigenda.' In adnotationibus, quas adjecit Pater Ballerini Editioni Romanæ Theologiæ Moralis P. Gury, dicitur hanc confessionem esse conformiorem Instructioni a Supremâ S. Officii Congregatione super modo reconciliandi hæreticos editæ, ex quâ Instructione deducitur, opportunam esse integram peccatorum confessionem. In textu P. Gury tenetur eam esse suadendam in praxi.

"Quum vero hic Auctor, tam in Theologiâ quam in casibus Conscientiæ, citaverit opinionem aliorum auctorum docentium propter existentiam dubii de primo baptismo a neo-conversis tempore infantiae suscepto (adeo ut si nullum id fuerit, vera baptismi susceptio sit ea, quæ occasione abjurationis

sub conditione traditur) dubiam esse obligationem peccata integre confitendi ante hoc baptisma conditionatum, nonnulli Confessarii in Anglia censuerunt, eos auctores secuti, dubiam confessionis integræ obligationem esse nullam obligationem : ac propter repugnantiam conversorum ad eam faciendam, et propter periculum confessionis imperfectæ vel etiam sacrilegæ, omnino expedire, ut conversi aliqua tantum peccata Confessario exponant, ut ab eo absolutionis sacramentalis, si forsân eâ opus sit, beneficium impetrent.

“ Ex aliâ parte habetur praxis constans maximæ partis Confessariorum Regni integram confessionem, tam ante quam post approbationem Concilii Provincialis, non modo suadentium, sed etiam exigentium ; habetur difficultas conversorum intellectum ad obsequium fidei ipsius captivandi, nisi per animi humilitatem et submissionem, quas in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ Christus Dominus reponere dignatus est ; habetur etiam impossibilitas sciendi, nisi per integram peccatorum manifestationem, utrum neo-conversus rite sit ad ipsum baptisma dispositus, velitque, ex. gr., restitutionem famæ vel bonorum (si ad eam teneri contigerit) facere, occasionem proximam peccandi vitare, a matrimonio nulliter contracto resilire etiamsi, per S. Sedis dispensationem (uti in casibus quotidie frequentioribus matrimonii post divortium civile contracti) illud sanari nequeat ; habetur insuper necessitas suæ salutis per justificationem in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ prospiciendi, a cujus integritate nemo in infantia semel baptizatus possit eximi ; attentâ præsertim diligentîâ juniorum e Clero Anglicano circa ritum baptizandi fideliter servandum, et attento proinde majori numero eorum, de quorum baptismatis infantilis valore non licet dubitare.

“ Quum vero certum sit, quod post plures annos confessionis integræ obligatio vim suam omnino sit amissura, si in praxi sequi valeant Theologi uti tutam opinionem auctorum præfatorum, Archiepiscopus Westmonasteriensis et Episcopi Angliæ enixe rogant, ut Sanctitas Vestra, pro suâ in Missiones Angliæ benignitate, dignetur declarare hâc super quæestione gravissimâ mentem Ecclesiæ :

“ An debeat, juxta Synodi Provincialis Decretum a S. Sede probatum, confessio Sacramentalis a neo-conversis in Angliâ exigî, et an ea debeat esse integra ? ”

---

## DECRETUM.

*Feriâ V. loco IV. die 17 Decembris, 1868.*

“ In Congregatione generali S. R. et U. Inquisitionis habitâ in Conventu S. Mariæ supra Minervam coram Emis ac Rmis DD. Cardinalibus contra hæreticam pravitatem generalibus inquisitoribus proposito suprascripto dubio præhabitisque DD. Consultorum suffragiis, iidem Emi ac Rmi Patres ad utramque dubii partem censuerunt respondendum esse : *Affirmative ; et dandum esse Decretum latum sub feriâ quintâ die decimaseptima Junii anni millesimi septingentesimi decimi quinti.*

*Eadem die ac Feriâ.*

“ SSmus D. N. D. Pius divinâ providentiâ Papa IX. in solitâ audientiâ R. P. D. Adessori Officii concessâ Resolutionem Emorum Patrum adprobare ac confirmare dignatus est ; eamque una cum memorato Decreto mandavit remitti R. P. D. Archiepiscopo Westmonasteriensi.”

ANGELUS ARGENTI S. R. et. U. I. Notarius.

## II. DECREE ON THE SAME SUBJECT IN 1715.

FERIÂ V. die 17 Junii 1715.

## DUBIUM.

“An plena fides sit adhibenda Carolo Wipperman de Rostoch in ducatu Mechlemburgh prædicanti et Lectori theologiæ Lutheranæ quietisticæ superintendenti et doctori primario sectæ Lutheranorum Quietistarum, S. Fidei catholicæ reconciliato in S. O. Parmæ, circa nonnullos errores detectos in ejus Baptismo; an ipsi credendum sit circa ea quæ enarrat, et quatenus affirmative, tum ut ipsius saluti, tum etiam ut cæterorum illius sectæ seu Regionis, præsertim si fuerint ignorantes, saluti pariter consulatur.

“Quæritur, an dictus Wipperman sit rebaptizandus, et quatenus affirmative, an absolute vel sub conditione; et quatenus affirmative, an teneatur confiteri omnia peccata præteritæ vitæ; et quatenus affirmative, an confessio præponenda sit, vel postponenda Baptismo conferendo sub conditione.

“SSmus auditus votis Emorum dixit: Carolum Ferdinandum esse rebaptizandum sub conditione; et collato Baptismo, ejus præteritæ vitæ peccata confiteatur, et ab iis sub conditione absolvatur.”

## III. LETTER FROM FOUR LOUVAIN PROFESSORS TO CARD.

DE ANDREA.

*Eminentissime Princeps:*

“Quum viris catholicis nihil antiquius esse debeat quam ut ad mentem Sedis Apostolicæ sententias suas exigant, nos infrascripti, in Universitate Catholicâ Lovaniensi Professores, controversiam, quæ de rationis humanæ vi nativâ non sine aliquo animorum æstu in Belgio nostro nunc agitur, ad arbitrium Sacræ Indicis Congregationis conferendam duximus; et foret nobis hoc sane quam gratissimum, Eminentissime Princeps, si Sacra Congregatio respondere dignaretur ad nonnullas quæ ad præsentem controversiam pertinent quæstiones. Quas antequam proponamus, pauca præfari nobis liceat.

“Rationalistæ, quod te non latet, Eminentissime Princeps, ut divinam revelationem radicitus evellant, magno conatu studioque id agunt, ut veritatum omnium, præsertim earum ex quibus constat religio naturalis, notitiam manare ostendant, veluti e suo fonte, ex absolutâ et omnino independenti mentis humanæ vi, et, ut aiunt, spontaneitate. Itaque fingunt, primævos homines principio quidem instar muti pecoris sylvestrem egisse vitam, at sensim sensimque, ope solius rationis suâ sponte sese evolventis, et sermonem invenisse, et civilem societatem condidisse, denique et cultum quemdam religiosum excogitasse atque instituisse. Hanc porro primam religionem,

utpote plane rudem atque imperfectam, non aliud quidem fuisse docent nisi crassam quamdam, ut aiunt, fetichismi formam, quam deinceps tamen homines, sicut litteras, artes, scientias, aut quodvis aliud humanum inventum, cogitando et ratiocinando perfecerint. Hinc comminiscuntur, apud Indos, Ægyptios, Græcos, cæterosque populos antiquos varias apparuisse polytheismi formas, quæ progressu temporis perpetuo perfectiores evaserint, ac totidem veluti gradus extiterint, per quos homo altiore illam religionis formam, quæ christiana vocatur, tandem fuerit assecutus. Atque ita sacratissimam nostram religionem pro nobiliore quodam humani ingenii foetu habent, ideoque et humanæ rationis iudicio atque dominio eam subjiciunt, eamdemque hujus unius rationis ope continuo quodam ac necessario progressu in dies ulterius perficiendam esse declarant.

“Atque hæc est, Eminentissime Princeps, theoria illa, quæ sub specioso nomine *progressus continui* in variis incredulorum scholis hodiedum docetur; atque inde hæc doctrina, tamquam teterrima quædam pestis, longe lateque serpit atque grassatur.

“In impiâ autem illâ et exitiosâ doctrinâ refellendâ, plerique ex recentioribus inter catholicos apologetis jam statim illud negant, scilicet rationem humanam pollere absolutâ illa ac penitus independenti vi sive spontaneitate, cui rationalistæ religionis originem acceptam referunt; at docent e contra, variisque argumentis ab experienciâ ductis probant, hominem, ut nunc nascitur, præter internam illam suæ rationis vim nativam, indigere externo aliquo intellectuali auxilio, ut obtineat eum rationis usum, qui illi sufficiat ut ad distinctam Dei notitiam et veritatum moralium cognitionem ope unius suæ rationis pervenire possit.

“Hanc vero de indigentiâ externi alicujus intellectualis auxilii sententiam, cui quamplurimi ex præstantissimis apologetis catholicis hodiedum subscribunt, ad pravam sensum detorserunt nonnulli Galliæ scriptores, quos traditionalistas appellant. Docent scilicet traditionalistæ illi, nullam veritatum metaphysicarum et moralium ideam menti humanæ a Deo inditam esse; ac mentem humanam habere videntur pro animi vi sive virtute mere passiva, docentes primam illarum veritatum ideam et cognitionem ex solâ institutione externâ, veluti ex unico fonte, in mentem influere, hominemque illarum veritatum notitiam eo fere modo acquirere, quo factum aliquod historicum ex aliorum testimonio discere solemus. Ex horum igitur sententiâ, testimonium Dei revelantis, quod ope continuæ traditionis servatum et in omnes populos propagatum [est], pro unico fonte et principio cognitionis veritatum religionis naturalis [est] habendum. Et fuere quoque nonnulli qui asserere non dubitarunt, fieri non posse ut homo illis ordinis naturalis veritatibus, quales sunt existentia Dei et animæ humanæ immortalitas, cum certitudine assensum præbeat, nisi prius divinæ revelationi fidem adhibuerit; et sententiam sententiæ suæ oppositam erroris insimularunt rationalistarum et semipelagianorum.

“Hanc vero traditionalistarum doctrinam professores Lovanienses, tum in suis prælectionibus, tum etiam in variis suis scriptis, tamquam falsam perpetuo improbarunt; et ad eam refellendam, inter alia, hæc monere solent:

1. “Videri, secundum illam traditionalistarum doctrinam, omnem veritatum ordinis naturalis cognitionem revocari ad actum fidei, atque ita tolli essentialem illam quæ exstat inter fidem et rationem differentiam. Atqui “rationis usus” (uti monuit Sacra Indicis Congregatio) “præcedit fidem, et ad eam hominem ope revelationis et gratiæ conducit.”

2. “Videri consequi ex eâdem illâ doctrinâ, humanæ menti abnegandam esse vim naturalis luminis, quod ei sufficiat ut ad cognitionem veritatum moralium pervenire possit; ideoque et videri doctrinam hanc propius accedere ad errores Baii, Calvini, etc., qui in statu naturæ lapsæ vires

rationis, quod ad veritates morales attinet, penitus extinctas esse docuerunt : atqui ex S. Scripturâ et communi SS. Patrum et theologorum consensu apertissime constare, hominem rationis usu fruente naturali suæ rationis lumine, absque ullo revelationis supernaturalis et gratiæ auxilio, posse cognoscere atque etiam demonstrare plures veritates metaphysicas et morales, inter quas existentia Dei et immortalitas animæ sint recensendæ. Sedulo quoque monent hic professores Lovanienses, omnino tenendum esse, ut ne ipsa fides concutiatur, exstare quædam fidei preambula, eaque *naturaliter* cognosci ; atque ibi recitant S. Congregationis Indicis declarationem illam, quâ dicitur : “ Ratiocinatio Dei existentiam, animæ spiritualitatem, hominis libertatem ; cum certitudine probare potest. Fides posterior est revelatione ; proindeque ad probandam Dei existentiam contra atheum, ad probandam animæ spiritualitatem ac libertatem contra naturalismi ac fatalismi sectatorem, allegari convenienter nequit.”

3. “ Videri porro consequi ex eâdem illâ doctrinâ, dicendum esse, ad cognitionem veritatum ordinis naturalis absolute necessariam fuisse revelationem supernaturalem ; atqui hoc adversari communi theologorum sententiæ, qui ibi non agnoscunt nisi moralem istiusmodi revelationis necessitatem.

“ Hæc igitur, inter alia, Eminentissime Princeps, contra eam traditionalistarum doctrinam ore et scripto monemus, atque inde a primo ejus ortu monuimus.

“ Quod si ab unâ parte humanæ rationis vires tuemur, ab alterâ tamen parte profiteamur, sicut jam supra innuimus, nos in eâ esse opinione, ut putemus non esse humanæ menti tribuendam omnimodam illam spontaneitatem sive absolutam independentiam, quam rationalistæ eidem tribuunt ; sed de mente humanâ sic sentimus : Mens humana vi pollet internâ sibi que propriâ ; per se et continuo actiosa est ; attamen, ut homo hac mente præditus perveniat ad expeditum usum rationis, opus habet externo aliquo intellectuali auxilio. Itaque opinamur, principia veritatum rationalium, metaphysicarum ac moralium, a Deo conditore humanæ menti indita esse ; at simul arbitramur, hanc esse mentis nostræ legem naturalem sive psychologiam, ut homo *indigeat institutione* aliquâ *intellectuali* ad obtinendum eum rationis usum, qui illi sufficiat ut distinctam Dei et veritatum moralium cognitionem sibi comparare possit. Non negamus, humanæ menti absque illâ institutione inesse confusum quemdam harum veritatum sensum, et vagam quamdam apprehensionem ; sed loquimur hic de verâ cognitione, hoc est, de clarâ et certâ illarum veritatum notitiâ acquirendâ. *Institutionem* autem intelligimus externum quodvis intellectuale auxilium, sive de industriâ, sive non datâ operâ præstitum, idque sive voce, sive scripto, sive gestu, sive alio quovis modo, quem sociale commercium suppeditat. *Indigentiam* porro intelligimus *absolutam* ; at non eo sensu, ut putemus, Deum non potuisse aliter condere hominem, sed eo sensu, ut putemus, esse eam indigentiam omnibus hominibus, quales nunc nascuntur, communem. Hanc vero absolutam institutionis indigentiam extare affirmamus, si sermo sit de expedito rationis usu acquirendo ; minime vero dicimus, quod e contra falsum putamus, singularum veritatum ordinis naturalis cognitionem ope institutionis esse comparandam : nam ubi homo jam usu suæ rationis reapse fruitur, ipso suâ solâ ratione quamplurimas veritates detegere atque cognoscere potest. Præterea notamus institutionem illam, quam dicimus ex nostrâ sententiâ, non esse habendam tamquam *efficientem causam per quam* homo perveniat ad expeditum rationis suæ usum, sed tamquam *meram conditionem sine quâ* non possit ad expeditum illum usum pervenire ; quemadmodum, verbi gratia, ær, calor, humor requiruntur tamquam *conditio sine quâ* non possit manifestari vita, quæ in aliquo grano seminis reapse inest, sed involuta ac latens. Principia legis naturæ *scripta* sunt in corde hominis ; verum ea numquam distincte *legere* quis poterit, nisi postquam ope intel-

lectualis illius, quod diximus, auxilii ad expeditum suæ rationis usum pervenerit.

“Sententiam nostram sive doctrinam hactenus expositam, Eminentissime Princeps, probare solemus variis argumentis ab experientiâ et observatione psychologicâ petitis, quæ hujus loci non est exponere.

“Patet autem, hâc doctrinâ, rationalismi principium de nativâ humanæ rationis independentiâ et *absolutâ*, ut aiunt, *spontaneitate* radicitus convelli; et tamen per eam nullatenus tolli, sed omnino integram et salvam in ea permanere nativam vim omnem humanæ rationis internam.

“Et possumus ex nostrâ doctrinâ contra rationalistas sic contendere: Si homo, ut rationalistæ docent, primitus in hac terra in statu ignorantie absolutæ constitutus fuisset, numquam solâ vi suâ ex hoc ignorantie statu exire potuisset, nec unquam (positâ eâdem naturæ conditione, quæ nunc est) sine Dei interventu, quocumque tandem modo iste interventus concipiatur, pervenire potuisset ad eum rationis usum, quo principia aut præcepta religionis naturalis cognovisset.

“Cæterum nostram hac de re sententiam adnumerandam esse arbitramur inter eas quæstiones, quæ a philosophis catholicis libere disputantur. Verumtamen R. D. Lupus, canonicus Leodiensis, in opere quod inscribitur: “*Le Traditionalisme et le Rationalisme examinés au point de vue de la Philosophie et de la doctrine catholique*,” nostram sententiam sive doctrinam *erroris theologici* insimulare non dubitat, et asseverare eam nexu indivulso cohærere cum perversis doctrinis Baii et Calvini, atque aperte repugnare doctrinæ catholicæ, Sacræ Scripturæ, et communi Patrum et theologorum sententiæ. Quas criminationes in quâdam epistolâ, nuper in Belgio longe lateque propagatâ, suâ auctoritate approbare et firmare visus est R. P. Perrone.

“Norunt tamen illi scriptores sententiam, quæ ab ipsis tam injuriose notatur, a multis auctoribus vere catholicis et doctis, non tantum in Belgio, sed etiam in Galliâ, in Germaniâ, in Italiâ propugnari; sciunt eam ut veram haberi ab Episcopis non paucis, et a pluribus theologis et philosophis, Sedi Apostolicæ ac sanis doctrinis addictissimis. Et notum pariter est, eandem sententiam in multis seminariis aliisque scholis catholicis cum assensu Episcoporum tradi atque doceri.

“Sed jam, post expositam nostram in controversiâ hâc sententiam, humiliter petimus ut nobis liceat, Eminentissime Princeps, sequentes propositiones S. Indicis Congregationis subijcere iudicio:

1. “An licet auctoribus catholicis, in disquisitione mere philosophicâ de vi nativâ rationis humanæ, docere: Deum, si voluisset, potuisse quidem ita condere hominem, ut is, ipsâ solâ suæ rationis vi, et ope veritatum ordinis naturalis menti ejus inscriptarum, nullo præterea indigens quocumque tandem externo intellectuali auxilio, pervenisset ad expeditum usum rationis:—videri tamen potius dicendum, hominem nunc ita nasci, ut ad expeditum illum rationis usum obtinendum præterea indigeat externo aliquo intellectuali auxilio, quod tamen non sit habendum tamquam *efficiens causa per quam* perveniat, sed tamquam mera *conditio sine quâ* non possit pervenire ad eum rationis usum, qui illi sufficiat ut distinctam Dei et veritatum moralium cognitionem sibi comparare queat?

2. “An licet auctoribus privatis, privatâ suâ auctoritate, eam sententiam censurâ notare asserendo, illam cum perversis Baii et Calvini doctrinis cohærere, atque S. Scripturæ, unanimi Patrum et theologorum sententiæ, definitionibus Ecclesiæ, et S. Indicis Congregationis propositionibus repugnare?

3. “Num Calviniana habenda est interpretatio eorum qui docent, verba Apostoli (*Rom. i. 19, 20*) accipienda esse de hominibus in vitæ societate inter se conjunctis, plenoque rationis usu fruentibus, ut ex totâ contextâ oratione confici videtur?



4. “ An licet reprehendere ac injuriose notare auctores catholicos qui asserunt, simili sensu, hoc est de hominibus pleno rationis usu fruentibus, intelligendam esse S. Indicis Congregationis propositionem hanc : “ Ratiocinatio Dei existentiam, animæ spiritualitatem, hominis libertatem, cum certitudine probare potest ? ”

“ Reliquum est, Eminentissime Princeps, ut optima quæque Eminentiae Vestrae apprecantes, scribendi finem faciamus cum humili voto, ut nos tui observantissimos benevolentia complecti digneris.

“ Datum Lovanii, kalend. Februarii MDCCCLX.”

---

# INDEX.

---

ACTA ET DECRETA CONCILII BALTIMORIENSIS, *noticed*, 212.

Andrea (Cardinal de), Letter of Louvain Professors to, 532.

BALTIMORE, Acts of the Council of, *noticed*, 212.

Baur (Professor), on Development, 40.

Beaulieu (le Comte de), L'Erreur libre dans l'Etat libre, *reviewed*, 361.

Bill to put an end to the Establishment of the Church in Ireland, *reviewed*, 452.

Bottalla (Rev. Paul, S.J.), Pope Honorius before the Tribunal of Reason and History, *reviewed*, 173.

Bouix (Abbé D.), La Condamnation de Galilée, *noticed*, 223.

————— Tractatus de Papâ, *noticed*, 476.

Buckley (Rev. N. B.), The Life and Writings of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary, *noticed*, 233.

CATHOLIC CONTROVERSIES, 361-384 : Unity of faith the most striking note of the Church in these days, 361 ; objection of some Catholics against propositions maintained in the REVIEW, 362 ; the Church has condemned tenets as unsound without condemning them as heretical, 363, 364 ; Catholics encouraged by the Church to write against condemned errors in their vernacular language, 365 ; the Pope's approbation of M. de Beaulieu's work, 366, 367 ; the Holy Father's letter concerning M. Veuillot, 368 ; the argument recapitulated, 369 ; precedents from former controversies, 370 ; the Church encourages Catholic controversies, 371 ; effect of the study of dogma on the intellect and interior life, 372 ; the Church's attitude towards non-heretical errors, 373 ; controversy with liberal Catholicism, 374 ; general objections against our course, 374-376 ; the due degree of intellectual submission in a Catholic, 376, 377 ; the accusation of disturbing the Church's peace, 378 ; unity of faith no reason for freedom from internal discord, 379, 380 ; the argument that such matters should be reserved for theological schools, 380, 381 ; the degree of assent due to doctrinal instructions of Pontifical congregations, 382 ; common argument of liberal Catholics, 383 ; general view of the duty of a Catholic review, 383, 384.

Catholic Truth Society, *noticed*, 484.

Chambers (J. D., M.A.), Strictures on the Judgment in "Martin v. Mackonochie," *reviewed*, 425.

Charbonnel (Abbé), Pensées de Louis Veuillot, *noticed*, 226.

CHURCH (THE) AND NAPOLEON I., 107-139 : Immense sources, published and unpublished, of M. d'Haussonville's work, 107 ; suppressions made by authority in the Napoleon correspondence, 108 ; especially as to corre

spondence concerning the Holy See, 109<sup>n</sup>; instances given by M. d'Haussonville, 110; his view of Napoleon's character, 111, 112; Napoleon's mistakes traceable to moral rather than intellectual defects, 113; his relations to Rome, 114; his acts as First Consul, 115; the Concordat, 116; Cardinal Consalvi and the organic articles, 117; the Abbés Bernier and Pancemont, 118; the character of Cardinal Caprara, 119; the coronation of Napoleon, 120; attachment of Pius VII. to Napoleon, 121; Jerome Bonaparte's American marriage, 122, 123; beginning of the contest between Napoleon and Pius VII., 124; Napoleon's letter requiring the Pope to declare war against England, 125; the Pope's reply, 126-129; Napoleon's extraordinary power at this time, 129, 130; the Pope's letter to his nuncio at Paris, 130-132; reasons why the Holy Father consented to forbid English and Russian ships to enter his ports, 132, 133; Napoleon's plans in regard to the Papacy, 133, 134; the new Catechism imposed on all the French dioceses, 134-137; his relations with the French clergy, 138, 139; note on the question of Josephine's marriage, 139.

CHURCH MUSIC AND CHURCH CHOIRS, 140-172: Summary of our last article, 140; by whom is our music to be sung, 141; Canon Oakeley's general view on this subject, 141-144; the decrees of the English and Dutch provincial synods, 144; necessity that music should be taught in all Catholic schools, 145; results already attained in this respect, 145-147; music taught to the peasantry in the middle ages, 148, 149; Mr. Nary on female singers and figured music, 150; boys' voices superior to women's in point of religious effect, 151; supply of boys, 152; the moral guidance of the choir boy, 153-155; where should singers be located, 155-157; the question of the orchestra in church, 157; congregational singing, 158; Mr. Nary's views of congregational singing, 159; Canon Oakeley's, 160; the Bishop of Langres' pastoral on the subject, 161, 162; Mass and Vespers as sung in France, 163; certain continental usages in choir performance, 164, 165; the children's mass, 166; preparation for a congregational mass, 167; practicability of teaching the Church Chant, 168; and elementary knowledge of Latin, 169; the teaching of Vespers and Complin, 170; explanation of the "Month," 171, 172.

Church Music and Church Choirs, *noticed*, 497.

Civiltà Cattolica, *noticed*, 467.

Cobb (Gerard F., M.A.), *The Kiss of Peace*, *noticed*, 243.

Coleridge (Sir J. T.), *Memoirs of the Rev. John Keble*, *noticed*, 504.

———— (Rev. H. J., S.J.), *Religion judged by the World*, *noticed*, 492.

———— *Vita Vitæ nostræ*, *noticed*, 495.

CONVENT CASE (THE), 385-398: English juries in Catholic cases, 385; Miss Saurin's statement of her case, 386; the Solicitor-General abandons her accusation that she was made to reveal her confession, 387; the Lord Chief Justice on this part of the case, 387, 388; on the character of the evidence for the convent, 389; general effect of his charge, 390; the animus of the jury, 391; Dr. Newman on British prejudice, 392; F. Harper's sermon, 393; F. Coleridge's, 394; character of the monas-

tic life, 395, 396 ; different spirit of the Bench from what it was at the time of the Achilli trial, 397, 398.

DECREE of Holy Office on reception of Converts in 1715, 532.

D'Haussonville (le Comte), *L'Eglise Romaine et le Premier Empire*, reviewed, 107.

Dupanloup (Mgr.), *The Future Œcumenical Council*, noticed, 474.

ECCLESIASTICAL Documents, 530.

Eustelle-Harpain (Marie), *The Life of*, noticed, 241.

FFOULKES'S (MR.) LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP MANNING, 269-308 : Mr. Ffoulkes's pamphlet considered as a specimen of sensational theology, 269 ; contrast with Dr. Pusey's style, 270 ; argument on the Holy Ghost's procession from the Son, 271 ; the Pope's power of sanctioning the addition of the *filioque*, 272 ; the seventh canon of Ephesus, 273 ; St. Cyril's anathemas, 274 ; the memorial of Charisius, 275, 276 ; the decree of the council of Chalcedon, 277, 278 ; Mr. Ffoulkes's comment on the canon of Chalcedon, 279, 280 ; his second reason for holding that the Church has no power to teach the procession, 281, 282 ; the teaching of the Holy See, 283 ; the Florentine definition, 284 ; the distinction between *taught* and *defined*, as of faith, 285 ; the letter of Pope S. Hormisdas, 286 ; the doctrine of Pope S. Leo III., 287 ; of Adrian I., 288 ; Adrian's reply to Charlemagne, 289 ; Charlemagne and S. Tarasius, 290 ; Mr. Ffoulkes's errors on the Church's constitution, 291, 293 ; letter of Clement IV. to the Greek emperor, 294 ; letter of Gregory X., 295 ; Mr. Ffoulkes on the authority exercised by the Pope, 296 ; the argument for hierarchical unity, 297 ; the conviction of the Popes themselves, 298 ; argument of Mr. Allies, 299 ; if not the Holy See, then what is the government of the Church ? 300 ; the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 301-303 ; Mr. Ffoulkes' Spanish scandal, 304 ; Mr. Ffoulkes's mental character, 305-307 ; his studies of the Catholic and other Churches, 308.

Ffoulkes (E. S.), *The Church's Creed or the Crown's Creed ?* noticed, 252 ; reviewed, 269.

GALLWEY (Father, S.J.), *Sermon at the Funeral of the Hon. C. Langdale. S.J.*, noticed, 486.

————— *Convent Life in England*, noticed, 492.

Garside (Rev. C. B.), *Preaching of the Cross*, noticed, 496.

Gérin (M.), *Letter of Pius IX. to*, noticed, 465.

Gillow (Rev. Dr.), *Letter on Catholic Higher Education*, 517.

GLADSTONE'S (MR.) IRISH POLICY, 452-464 : Character of Lord Palmerston's Irish policy, 452 ; change in the position of statesmen since his death, 453 ; state of Ireland under Lord Palmerston's government, 454 ; Mr. Gladstone's action in Irish affairs, 455 ; skill of his scheme of disestablishment, 456 ; Mr. Disraeli's line of defence, 457 ; the conditions of Mr. Gladstone's policy, 458 ; his method of disestablishment, 459 ; organization of the new Church body, 460 ; Mr. Gladstone's method of disendowment, 461 ; the case of the Maynooth professors, 462 ; the settlement of the Church lands, 463 ; the next step, 464.

Gladstone (Right Hon. W. E., M.P.), A Chapter of Autobiography, *noticed*, 229.  
 ----- Speeches delivered in October, 1868,  
*reviewed*, 203.

Grant (J.), Saurin v. Star and Kennedy Report, *reviewed*, 385.

Guéranger (Dom P.), The Liturgical Year, *noticed*, 267.

Guyot (Abbé), Somme des Conciles, *noticed*, 264.

HALLIWELL (J. O., F.S.A.), Sir John Manndevile's Voyages, *noticed*, 260.

Harper (Rev. T., S.J.), Silence of Christian Transfigurations, *noticed*, 492.

Hegel's Theory of Development, 39.

Hood (Rev. Edwin), Lamps, Pitchers, and Trumpets, *noticed*, 261.

IRELAND AND THE NEW MINISTRY, 203-211 : The present political situation predicted in the DUBLIN REVIEW of April, 1865, 203 ; character of the policy of independent opposition, 204 ; the present political condition of Ireland, 205 ; character of the changes made in the Irish representation at the general election, 206 ; principles upon which Mr. Gladstone constructed his Government, 207 ; the attitude of the Irish Catholics and of the Irish Protestants, 208, 209 ; the question of the disposition of the funds of the Establishment, 209 ; suggestion that they should be employed in order to settle the land question, 210, 211.

JESUITS (THE) IN CANADA, 70-86 : Presumptuous character of the present age, 70 ; Mr. Parkman's qualifications for his task, 71 ; his testimony to Abbé Faillon's work, 72 ; his disbelief in the supernatural, 73 ; his general view of the Canadian Catholic missions, 74 ; his view of the Jesuits as a body, 75 ; the martyr Jean de Brébeuf, 76, 77 ; Mr. Parkman's testimony to the character of other Jesuits, 78 ; his opinion of devotees and nuns, 79, 80 ; the Ursulines of Quebec and Montreal, 80-82 ; Paul de Chomedry and the early Catholic laity of Canada, 82-84 ; the Jesuits and the Iroquois, 85 ; Catholic and Protestant missionaries, 85, 86.

JOHN DAMASCENE (S.), 331-361 : The age of patristic literature very short, 331 ; interval in it of two centuries and a half, 332 ; S. Sophronius and S. Maximus, 333 ; spread of Mahometanism, 334 ; site of Damascus, 335, 336 ; birth and family of S. John, 337 ; his childhood, 338 ; the monk Cosmas, 339 ; his training of S. John, 340 ; Leo the Isaurian, 341 ; S. John on Holy Images, 342 ; on worship and adoration, 343 ; on the tradition of the Fathers, 344 ; points from the second and third orations, 345, 346 ; perfidious conduct of the Emperor Leo, 347, 348 ; the miracle of S. John's right hand, 348, 349 ; he retires into Mar Saba, 349, 350 ; his work on *De fide orthodoxa*, 350-353 ; the manuscripts of S. Sabas, 354 ; specimens of his style, 354-356 ; his arguments against the Jacobites and Manicheans, 357 ; his sacred parallels, 358 ; his homilies on our Blessed Lady, 359 ; his hymns and music, 359, 360 ; his place in Greek theology, 360, 361.

KING (E.), Keighley Hall, and other Tales, *noticed*, 252.

Kuhn (Dr. J.) Katholische Dogmatik, *reviewed*, 28.

LAFORET (Mgr. L. J.), Why Men do not Believe, *noticed*, 221.

- Letter of Pius IX. on the Gallican Articles, *noticed*, 465.
- Liddon (Henry Parry, M.A.), Bampton Lectures on the Divinity, *reviewed*, 28.
- Liturgical Rules for Organists, Singers, and Composers, *reviewed*, 140.
- Lloyd (E. M.), The Freedom of the Will, *noticed*, 218.
- Lockhart (William, B.A.), The Communion of Saints, *noticed*, 222.
- Secession or Schism, *noticed*, 222.
- Longfellow (H. W.), The Divine Comedy Translated, *reviewed*, 398.
- Longman (W.), History of Edward III., *noticed*, 506.
- Louvain, Letter of four Professors to Cardinal de Andrea, 532.
- MACCOLL (Rev. Malcolm, M.A.), Is there not a Cause ? *noticed*, 232.
- McCarthy (Charles), Lives of Benedictine Writers of S. Maur, *noticed*, 257.
- Manndevile (Sir John), The Voyage and Travaille of, *noticed*, 260.
- Mansel (Dean) on the Doctrine of Development, 36.
- Martineau (James), a Word for Scientific Theology, *noticed*, 217.
- Maurice (F. D.), The Conscience, *noticed*, 217.
- Meynell (Rev. C., D.D.), Padre Liberatore and the Ontologists, *noticed*, 216.
- Mills (Rev. Alexius), Some Remarks upon the Dean of Westminster's  
"Characteristics of the Papacy," *noticed*, 251.
- Letter to the Editor, 512.
- Montalembert (le Comte de), L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre, *reviewed*, 361.
- Month (The), *noticed*, 227.
- February, 1869, *noticed*, 497.
- Murray (Patrick, D.D.), De Ecclesia, 297.
- Essay on Education, *reviewed*, 86.
- NARY (Rev. James) on Church Music, *reviewed*, 140.
- NEWMAN'S (F.) OXFORD PAROCHIAL SERMONS, 309-330 : Ephemeral character of Protestant sermons in general, 309 ; presentation of Mr. Newman to the Vicarage of S. Mary, 310 ; Oriel College, 311, 312 ; the Parish of S. Mary's, 313, 314 ; connection of S. Mary's Church and the University, 315 ; the function of Select Preacher, 316 ; the University sermon, 317 ; commencement of Mr. Newman's incumbency, 318 ; beginning of the "short discourses," 319 ; the attire of Oxford in those days, 320 ; Mr. Newman's appearance, 321 ; his diligence as college tutor, 322 ; his rising reputation as a preacher, 323 ; increasing effect of the sermons, 324 ; character of his teaching, 325 ; its intense effect on the audience, 326 ; his first doubts of Anglicanism, 327, 328 ; his retirement to Littlemore, 329 ; his last volume of Anglican sermons, 330.
- Newman (J. H., D.D.), Essay on Development, *reviewed*, 28.
- Parochial and Plain Sermons, *reviewed*, 309.
- New Testament Narrative (The), *noticed*, 265.
- OAKLEY (Canon) on Church Music, *reviewed*, 140.
- Orleans (Mgr. l'Évêque d'), L'Enfant, *noticed*, 501.
- (Bishop of), The Future Œcumenical Council, *noticed*, 474.
- ORTHODOXY (THE) OF POPE HONORIUS, 173-202 : Completeness and excellence of F. Bottalla's reply to Mr. Renouf, 173 ; Mr. Renouf's first proposition that Honorius taught heresy ex cathedrâ, 174 ; first reply to



this proposition, 175, 176 ; second reply to this proposition, 177 ; proofs that the letters to Sergius were not *ex cathedrâ*, 178 ; reply to the argument drawn from the 6th and 8th Councils, 179, 180 ; S. Leo's confirmation of the 6th Council, 180, 181 ; S. Leo II. and the anathema upon Honorius, 182 ; Mr. Renouf's treatment of the evidence of Abbot John and other contemporary witnesses, 183, 184 ; Pope Martin I. and the Lateran Council, 184, 185 ; the actual contents of Honorius's letters, 185, 186 ; frightful consequences of the monothelite doctrine, 186-188 ; the different forms which it assumed, 188, 189 ; Honorius ignorant of the monothelite heresy, 190 ; analysis of his two letters, 191-193 ; Catholic doctrine as to the texts in question, 193, 194 ; probable view taken by Honorius, 195-197 ; conclusion as to Honorius's orthodoxy, 198 ; Latin translations of the letters of Honorius, 199-202.

PARKMAN (Francis), *The Jesuits in North America*, *reviewed*, 70.

PEREZ' (F.) AND MR. LONGFELLOW'S DANTE, 398-425 : F. Perez's view of the Purgatorio, 398, 399 ; the theological theory of Purgatory, 400 ; the twofold process of purification, 401 ; the new ærial body, 402, 403 ; patience of the suffering souls, 404 ; their eagerness for suffering, 405 ; Christ the archetype of the blessed, 406 ; Our Lady and the penitents in purgatory, 407 ; the prayer of the souls confined, 408 ; Mary of the Angels, 409 ; souls suffering for pride, 410, 411 ; for envy, 412, 413 ; for anger, 414 ; for sloth, 415, 416 ; for avarice, 417, 418 ; the sixth circle, 419-421 ; the seventh circle, 421-423 ; general character of F. Perez's book, 423, 424 ; Mr. Longfellow's translation, 424.

Ponlevoy (Father de), *Life of F. de Ravignan*, *noticed*, 492.

PRINCIPLES OF CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION, 86-106 : Constant discussion of the topic of education among our higher and middle classes, 86 ; the six different plans of higher education proposed, 87 ; general character of Dr. Murray's essay on education, and of the pamphlet "What does it profit a man ?" 87, 88 ; first principle of Catholic higher education, that it should develop and strengthen the various mental faculties, 88 ; classics and mathematics as an intellectual foundation, 89 ; second principle of Catholic higher education, that it should indoctrinate the student with Catholic truth in itself and in its bearing on things secular, 89 ; English general literature violently anti-Catholic, 90 ; necessity that Catholic higher education should be in harmony with the Church's doctrinal teaching, 91 ; illustration from the Catholic and the infidel standard of human virtuousness, 92-94 ; atheistic spirit of English philosophy at present, 94, 95 ; relations of philosophy and theology, 96 ; the Bull "Mirari vos" on indifferentism, 97, 98 ; Dr. Murray on the results of mixed education, 99 ; the "Son of a Catholic squire" on the literature and spirit of the present time, 100 ; Dr. Murray on the low state of religious knowledge among young men, 101 ; amount of religious instruction necessary in Catholic higher education, 102 ; third principle of Catholic higher education that it should enable the student to come into as close contact as possible with the English Protestant mind, 103 ; illustrations from historical and philosophical studies, 104 ; recapitulation of the argument 105 ; serious objection to the suggestion of the "Month"

